LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-203
S. 959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 959

Jan. 3, 1957	Rep. Keating introduced H. R. 271 which was referred to tthe House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan. 9, 1957	Sen. Watkins introduced S. 403 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan. 17, 1957	Sen. Byrd introduced S. 658 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan. 29, 1957	Sen. Potter introduced S. 901 and Sens. Williams and Butler introduced S. 959 which were referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Prints of bills as introduced.
Mar. 13, 1957	Rep. Hoffman introduced H. R. 5937 which was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill as introduced.
Apr. 10, 1957	Rep. Anfuso introduced H. R. 6784 which was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill as introduced.
June 14, 1957	Senate committee ordered S. 959 reported with amendment.
June 17, 1957	Senate committee reported S. 959 with amendment. Senate Report No. 458. Print of bill and report. Print of amendment proposed by Sen. Williams.
June 24, 1957	Senate passed S. 959 with amendment. House subcommittee ordered H. R. 6784 reported with amendment.
June 25, 1957	S. 959 was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture.
July 1, 1957	Rep. Anfuso introduced H. R. 8456 which was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill as introduced.
July 15, 1957	House committee reported H. R. 8456 without amendment. House Report No. 813. Print of bill and report.
July 24, 1957	House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 8456. H. Res. 363, House Report No. 875. Print of resolution and report.
Aug. 2, 1957	House passed H. R. 8456 with amendments, then House vacated this action and passed S. 959 with amendments, substituting the language of H. R. 8456.

Aug. 7, 1957	Senate disagreed with House amendments. Senate conferees appointed.
	Speeches in the House during debate on H. R. 8456.
Aug. 8, 1957	House conferees were appointed.
Aug. 15, 1957	Conferees agreed to file conference report.
Aug. 16, 1957	House received conference report. House Report No. 1180. Print of report.
Aug. 19, 1957	House agreed to conference report.
Aug. 20, 1957	Senate agreed to conference report.
Aug. 28, 1957	Approved: Public Law 85-203

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-203

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT EXEMPTIONS. Provides that the Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or any subsequent year providing the total acreage of wheat on the farm does not exceed 30 acres, none of such crop of wheat is removed from the farm except for processing purposes, and the entire crop of wheat is used on the farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock. Provides that no acreage in the commercial wheat-producing area seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Provides for the modification of Sec. 114 of the Soil Bank Act to the extent that no person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under the Soil Bank Program on any farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under Sec. 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

H. R. 271

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 271

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 3, 1957

Mr. KEATING introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with

respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1955 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. If an exemption becomes void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption under this subsection shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 271

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KEATING

JANUARY 3, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

S. 403

A BILL

H. R. 271

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 403

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 9 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957

Mr. WATKINS introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with

respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1956 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner, or operator of the farm;

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions. Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 403

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WATKINS

JANUARY 9 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

S. 658

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 658

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 17 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957

Mr. BYRD introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1955 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner, or operator of the farm;

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 658

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BYRD

JANUARY 17 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

S. 901

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 901

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 29, 1957

Mr. POTTER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with

respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1956 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner, or operator of the farm;

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions. Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 901

A BILL

To further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. POTTER

JANUARY 29, 1957
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 29, 1957

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, de-

liver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this Act;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions."

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if

such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955 or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the Act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this Act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BUTLER

JANUARY 29, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

H. R. 5937

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5937

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 13, 1957

Mr. HOFFMAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this Act;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions."

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted

to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the Act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this Act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5937

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HOFFMAN

MARCH 13, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

H. R. 6784

A BILL

A BILL

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6784

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 10, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1957 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however,* That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage

planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Except as provided in section 335 (e) of this Act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (e) and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That any State in which for three successive years the annual acreage planted to wheat exceeds 35,000 acres, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing

year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area and the acreage planted to wheat in such State in such three years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided further,* That any State placed in the commercial wheat producing area under the foregoing proviso shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat in such State is less than 25,000 acres for three consecutive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area if he determines that such designation would permit more efficient administration of this Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949."

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6784

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANFUSO

APRIL 10, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 17, 1957
For actions of June 14, 1957
85th-1st, No. 103

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed mutual security bill. Senate committee ordered reported bills to release extra long staple cotton for stockpile, to modify relation of supports on burley and Virginia tobacco, to exempt certain wheat producers from marketing penalties, and to transfer wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by right of eminent domain. Sen. Smith, N.J., introduced and discussed bills to establish Senior Civil Service, improve employment practices, and create Advisory Council of Health.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 6500, the D.C. appropriation bill for 1958 (p. 8109). Senate conferees were appointed June 11.

2. HOUSING. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 6659, the housing bill (p. 8109). Senate conferees were appointed May 29.

3. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Lane spoke in favor of legislation to assist local distressed areas in economic redevelopment. pp. 8147-48

4. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported S. 1521, to exempt student trainee appointees from the Civil Service provision prohibiting the employment of more than two members of a family in the classified service. p. D531

5. FARM POLICY. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Policy of the Joint Economic Committee announced that it had selected Dr. George E. Brandow as staff economist to conduct its forthcoming study of agricultural policy. p. D532

6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the Consent Calendar will be called Mon., June 17, to be followed during this week with consideration of H.R. 6974, to extend Public Law 480; H.R. 7221, the conference report on the

third supplemental appropriation bill; H.R. 8090, the public works appropriation bill; H.R. 7125, excise tax amendments; S. 469, to extend Federal supervision of Klamath Indians; H.R. 7168, the Federal construction contract procedures bill; and H.R. 3753, to extend loans to homesteaders and desert-land entrymen. p. 8145

7. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 17. p. 8151

SENATE

8. FOREIGN AID. Passed, 57-25, with amendments S. 2130, the mutual security authorization bill. pp. 8171-8260.
Agreed to the following amendments:
Committee amendments (pp. 8171, 8254).
By Sen. Gore, to prohibit loans without firm commitments of repayment and a finding of reasonable prospects for repayment (pp. 8230-1).
By Sen. Fulbright, to authorize the use of $10 million of funds for assistance to U. S. schools abroad, as amended by Sen. Humphrey's amendment to urge special efforts to utilize Public Law 480 funds for this purpose (pp. 8237-40).
By Sen. Ellender, to require a report to Congress on each financing operation involving the assets of the fund (pp. 8241-2).
By Sen. Javits, to study ways to facilitate travel (p. 8251).
Rejected the following amendments:
By Sen. Morse, 32 to 54, to delete the $750 million per year borrowing authority of the Development Loan Fund and eliminating technical language making it a revolving fund (pp. 8211-26).
By Sen. Morse, 22 to 61, to require 15 days notice before the President waived requirements of the act for $100 million of the funds (reduced from $250 million) (pp. 8226-9, 8230).
By Sen. O'Mahoney, 31 to 53, to require full and current reports of all activities under the law (pp. 8231-7).
By Sen. Ellender, to delete language increasing the limitation on grants to the U. N. technical assistance fund to 45% (pp. 8240-1).
By Sen. Case, to increase the sums earmarked for the sale for foreign currencies of agricultural commodities from $200 million to $225 million (pp. 8242-51).
By Sen. Ellender, to require that sums appropriated under the Mutual Security Act be passed in a separate bill and not be included in the Defense Department or other appropriation bill (p. 8254).

9. ~~PEANUTS; COTTON; TOBACCO;~~ WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported ~~the following bills:~~
~~Without~~ amendment, S. 609, deleting the requirement for reports from persons operating peanut picking or threshing machines (p. D530);
~~Without~~ amendment, H. J. Res. 172, authorizing withdrawal from the stockpile for CCC sale of 50,000 bales of extra-long staple cotton (p. D530);
~~Without amendment, H.R. 7259, redefining types of Virginia tobaccos (p. D530);~~
With amendment, S. 959, to exempt from liability producers of wheat to be used for feed or seed on the farm (p. D530);
With amendments, S. 606, permitting the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken from the farmer by eminent domain (p. D530).

10. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported with amendments H.R. 4602, to encourage veterans residential housing in rural areas (major amendment would reduce authorizations for direct loans from $200 million to $50 million). p. D530

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 18, 1957
For actions of June 17, 1957
85th-1st, No. 104

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills to modify relation of supports on burley and Virginia tobacco, exempt certain wheat producers from marketing penalties, transfer wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by right of eminent domain, and eliminate requirements for certain peanut reports. Sen. Capehart commended Industrial Uses Commission's report. Sen. Purtell criticized Department's report on Humane slaughter bill. Sen. Humphrey inserted statement on use of food and

(see p. 6.)

SENATE

1. PEANUTS; TOBACCO; WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported ~~the following bills:~~
   Without amendment, S. 609, eliminating the requirement of reports from persons operating peanut picking or threshing machines (S. Rept. 456), p. 8280;
   Without amendment, H.R. 7259, to modify the relation of supports on burley and Virginia tobaccos (S. Rept. 457), p. 8280;
   With amendment, S. 959, to exempt from marketing penalties producers of wheat used for seed or feed on the farm (S. Rept. 458), p. 8280;
   With amendments, S. 606, to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken from the farmer by right of eminent domain (S. Rept. 459), p. 8280

2. ATOMIC ENERGY. Debated the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. pp. 8267-77, 8343-76, 8382-3, 8384-90

3. RESEARCH. Sen. Capehart commended the report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products, inserted his bill to expand research activities to discover new uses, and inserted his speech on the subject. pp. 8329-36

4. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. Sen. Purtell urged the passage of humane slaughter legislation and inserted this Department's adverse report on the bill and his letter to Sen. Ellender criticizing it. pp. 8336-7

5. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Watkins inserted a speech by the Governor of Utah, "A Midcentury Appraisal of Water and Power Needs." pp. 8337-9

6. WATER POLLUTION. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging increased efforts to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay area. p. 8278

7. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Johnson urged increased spending for flood control and the development of water resources. pp. 8286-7

8. FISCAL POLICY. Sen. Johnson criticized the Administration's monetary and credit policies, which he said deterred local government bodies from borrowing money. p. 8287

9. TAX AMORTIZATION. Sen. Neuberger inserted a letter from an engineer to the President discussing the probable cost of the fast tax writeoff granted the Idaho Power Co. pp. 8376-9

10. FOOD DISTRIBUTION. Sen. Humphrey inserted his statement on the use of food and fiber in our foreign policy. pp. 8383-4

HOUSE

11. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 8002, to provide for stating appropriation estimates on an accrued expenditure basis (H. Rept. 572). p. 8437

12. ADVISORY COMMITTEES. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H.R. 7390, to amend the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 so as to require reports to Congress prior to the establishment of certain advisory committees (H. Rept. 576). p. 8437

13. RESEARCH. Received the report of the President's bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to Agriculture Committee. p. 8437

14. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 7441, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1958 (Senate conferees were appointed June 11), and H.R. 6070, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1958 (Senate conferees were appointed June 12). p. 8394

15. MEATS. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Marshall, H.R. 7244, to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 so as to permit deductions for a self-help meat promotion program. p. 8395

16. PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments S. 601, relative to the charging of interest on deposits in the civil service retirement fund during certain periods of separation from the service. H.R. 3084, a similar bill, was laid on the table. p. 9396

17. CONTRACTS. Passed as reported H.R. 7536, to extend the termination date of title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941 from June 30, 1957 to June 30, 1958. Under title II the President may authorize any department or agency of the Government, which is dealing with national defense, to make contracts

Calendar No. 465

85TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 458

WHEAT USED ENTIRELY FOR FEED, SEED, OR FOOD ON THE FARM—EXEMPTION FROM MARKETING PENALTIES

JUNE 17, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 959]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

This bill would exempt excess wheat from marketing penalties if the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or food on the farm where grown. It would be retroactive to cover the 1954, 1955, and 1956 crops, as well as future crops. If exemptions were obtained on the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crops, penalties paid on such crops would be refunded; wheat stored to avoid such penalties would be released from storage; and the Secretary would pay producers the value of any wheat delivered to him to avoid such penalties. Except for retroactivity and provisions with respect to food use, the first section of the bill is identical to S. 46, which passed the Senate in 1955, and is substantially the same as S. 403, S. 658, and S. 901 introduced by Senators Watkins, Byrd, and Potter, respectively. The substance of this provision was also included in an amendment offered by Senator Potter to S. 1771 earlier this year.

Section 2, which would be added by the committee amendment, would amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act to permit farmers who obtain exemptions from marketing penalties under the first section of the bill to qualify for payments under the acreage reserve programs for other commodities and the conservation reserve program, even though they exceed their wheat acreage allotments. (Sec. 114 disqualifies farmers who exceed their allotments from eligibility to receive any payments under the Soil Bank Act.)

The bill and the committee amendment are further explained in the attached letters from the Department of Agriculture.

Section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 restricts the marketing quota referendum to farmers who will be subject to the quota, and producers exempt under the bill would therefore not be eligible to vote. The Secretary should, by appropriate regulation, require producers to elect whether they will vote in the referendum or maintain their eligibility for an exemption under the bill. Applications from producers for exemption should not be approved after they have elected, by voting in the referendum, to remain subject to quotas. Since exemptions are made on a farm basis, the Secretary may provide that the election of any producer on the farm to remain subject to quotas. Since exemptions are made on a farm basis, the Secretary may provide that the election of any producer on the farm to remain subject to the quota shall prevent the exemption from being granted for the farm. The requirement that producers make an election as to whether they will vote in the referendum or maintain their eligibility for an exemption should, of course, only be made applicable to referendums held with respect to the 1959 and subsequent crops.

The exemption provided by the bill is restricted to farms which consume all of the wheat they produce and introduce no wheat into commerce. The exemption is null and void if the conditions upon which it is granted are not met, and the entire crop would be subject to the penalty provisions of the act if even the smallest quantity should be removed from the farm contrary to the provisions of the bill. It is expected that the Secretary would take special care to see that the conditions of exemption are fulfilled and that the amount of wheat moving in commerce is not increased by any wheat produced on farms exempted under the bill.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., January 28, 1957.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the first session of the 84th Congress the Senate passed S. 46, a bill to exempt certain wheat producers from liability for wheat marketing quota penalties under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, where all the wheat is fed or used for seed on the farm on which produced. Identical bills were introduced in the House of Representatives, but no action was taken by the House on any of those bills or on S. 46.

The Department of Agriculture reported favorably on S. 46 and H. R. 1834, one of the House bills. On January 27, 1956, the Department addressed a letter to Hon. Harold D. Cooley, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, recommending the enactment of S. 46, with certain proposed amendments which would have (1) extended the exemption to wheat used on the farm where produced as human food; (2) made the provision retroactive to the 1954 crop of wheat; and (3) in the case of farmers entitled to the exemption, provided for the release from storage of wheat stored to postpone or

avoid the penalty and for the reimbursement for penalties paid in 1954, 1955, or 1956 and for the value of wheat delivered in 1954, 1955, or 1956 to the Secretary of Agriculture to avoid penalties.

Several bills embodying the provisions of S. 46 have been introduced in the 85th Congress. I urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given by the Congress to such proposed legislation. Enclosed is a draft which embodies the provisions of S. 46 together with the amendments which were proposed by this Department to Congressman Cooley in January 1956. It is recommended that these amendments be incorporated in the bills when they are acted upon by the Congress.

The purpose of the legislation is to correct a situation which has arisen in connection with marketing quota operations for certain wheat producers who desire to use their entire output for food, feed, and seed on the farm where produced and who do not want to participate in the wheat price support program. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, any wheat producer subject to marketing quotas who harvests wheat in excess of his farm acreage allotment is subject to a marketing penalty on the farm marketing excess (unless he avoids or postpones the penalty by storage or delivery to the Secretary), whether he sells his wheat on the market or feeds it on his farm. The law is clear on this point and its constitutionality was upheld in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111). Thus, farmers subject to quotas who produce wheat only for food, feed and seed and do not want price support on their crop are forced to curtail their operations or pay the penalty if they fail to do so.

Production of wheat for food, feed and seed is in general confined to small farms in the feed deficit areas.

Existing legislation exempts certain of these farms from marketing quota restrictions. For example, quotas are not applicable to any farm on which the wheat acreage does not exceed 15 acres or on which the normal production of the wheat acreage is less than 200 bushels. Also marketing quotas are not applicable to any farm in any State which has been designated by the Secretary as outside the commercial wheat-producing area. Any State for which the wheat acreage allotment is 25,000 acres or less may be so designated by the Secretary.

The proposed legislation broadens these existing exemptions to include those farmers in the commercial wheat-producing area who harvest more than 15 acres, who use all their wheat on the farm where grown for food, feed and seed, and who do not desire price support. Insofar as these farmers are concerned, wheat marketing quota restrictions impose special hardships.

Accordingly, although the consumption of wheat on farms where grown does affect interstate commerce, the proposed exemption relating only to farms on which no wheat is removed would appear to be desirable. Such farmers constitute only a small portion of all farmers who produce wheat and the proposed exemption, although creating some new problems, would not unduly hamper the administration of the wheat marketing quota and price support program with respect to farms from which wheat is removed. This would not be the case, however, if the exemption with respect to food, feed and seed were to apply to farms on which wheat is produced both for home consumption and for sale.

With present legislation providing for no marketing quotas on corn and other feed grains and price support for feed grains other than corn

being available to producers with no restriction on production, the restrictions upon the feeding of wheat produced on a farmer's own farm appear to be untenable.

Enactment of the legislation would be another step toward achievement of our objective—that farmers be permitted to operate their farms with a maximum of freedom. It would provide more adequate feed in areas which in the past have not produced sufficient feed for local livestock and poultry production. And it would remove the dissatisfaction of many small wheat producers with the program as it must be operated under present legislation.

Some additional administrative expenses would be incurred in carrying out the legislation. Such increases could, we believe, be generally absorbed from funds appropriated for the wheat marketing quota program.

The bill provides that funds collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit may be used to make the refunds provided for therein. Additional funds for such refunds will need to be appropriated only to the extent that such wheat penalty collections are not sufficient therefor.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. Benson, *Secretary.*

Department of Agriculture,
Washington 25, D. C. April 4, 1957.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Ellender: On January 28, 1957, this Department transmitted to the Congress a proposed bill to exempt certain wheat producers from liability for wheat marketing quota penalties under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, where all the wheat is fed or used for human feed or seed on the farm where produced.

Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act provides that as a condition of eligibility for participation in the acreage reserve program under that act the wheat acreage on any farm must not exceed the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment or 15 acres. In order to clarify the matter of eligibility for participation in the acreage reserve program of any farm for which an exemption from marketing quota penalties might be obtained under the bill submitted by us on January 28, 1957, we believe it highly desirable that such bill be supplemented by a new section containing an amendment to the Soil Bank Act which would make it clear that any farm for which an exemption from marketing quota penalties was obtained under the proposed bill would not be required to comply with the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment or 15 acres to be eligible for participation in the acreage reserve program.

We believe that farmers who might obtain an exemption from wheat marketing quota penalties because their entire wheat production is used on the farm where produced should be entitled to participate in the acreage reserve program on exactly the same basis as those

farmers who avail themselves of the 15-acre exemption. We, therefore, recommend that there be added at the end of the bill we transmitted on January 28, 1957, a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

"'(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or'."

The Department favors the enactment of the bill as so amended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 335. * * *

(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this Act;

(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955 or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the Act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this Act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

Agricultural Act of 1956, as Amended

TITLE I—SOIL BANK ACT

Sec. 114. No person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under this title with respect to any farm for any year in which (1) the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or (2) *in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,* the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or (3) the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect. For the purpose of this section, a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment or base acreage and, in the case of wheat, unless such producer knowingly exceeded the farm acreage allotment or fifteen acres, whichever is larger.

○

Calendar No. 465

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

[Report No. 458]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 29, 1957

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 17, 1957

Reported by Mr. WILLIAMS, with an amendment

[Insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, de-

liver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this Act;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions."

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if

such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the Act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this Act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence

thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or".

Calendar No. 465

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

[Report No. 458]

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BUTLER

JANUARY 29, 1957
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 17, 1957
Reported with an amendment

Calendar No. 465

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 17, 1957

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, viz: On page 3, after line 23, insert the following new paragraph:

If any producer on the farm votes in any referendum under section 336, beginning with the referendum applicable to the 1959 crop, no producer on the farm shall be eligible for exemption under this section with respect to the crop to which such referendum is applicable.

Calendar No. 465

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

JUNE 17, 1957

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 25, 1957
For actions of June 24, 1957
85th-1st, No. 109

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Interior appropriation bill. Senate passed bills to: Exempt from quotas certain wheat used on farm where produced. Permit the transfer of certain wheat acreage allotments. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to exempt from quotas certain wheat used on farm where produced. Rep. McGovern said wheat vote indicates farmers favor crop controls. Rep. Udall criticized acreage reserve program. Reps. Abernethy, Harvey, and Jennings introduced and discussed industrial uses bills.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 5189, Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill for 1958, which includes Forest Service items. pp. 9042, 9043-68.
   Agreed to the following amendments:
   All committee amendments which were then considered as original text. pp. 9043-4
   By Sen. Smith, Maine, to provide $500,000 for assistance to States planting trees under Title IV of the Soil Bank. pp. 9044-5
   Sens. Hayden, Chavez, Magnuson, Mundt, and Young were appointed conferees. p. 9068

2. WHEAT. Passed with amendment S. 959, to exempt producers from quotas for wheat grown to be used for feed, seed, or food on the farm. Adopted the committee amendments and Sen. William's amendment to make ineligible any farm on which a producer votes in a wheat referendum, beginning in 1959. pp. 9077-9.
   Passed as reported S. 606, to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments lost due to the use of the right of eminent domain by the Federal, State, or local government. pp. 9080-1

3. FORESTS. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 469, to aid the Klamath Indians in terminating Federal supervision. House conferees have not yet been appointed. p. 9085

Received Calif. Legislature resolutions urging that the Secretary of Agriculture retain full authority over the National Forests rather than impose a limited use such as wilderness preservation (p. 9028) urging a study of Federal lands to ascertain the desirability of payments in lieu of taxes in some areas (pp. 9028-9), and urging plywood import restrictions (pp. 9029-30).

Sen. Neuberger inserted an editorial "Saving Wilderness Areas." p. 9039

Sen. Murray urged that the full authorization for timber access roads be made available in the Forest Service appropriation. p. 9041

4. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Sen. Morse inserted 15 telegrams congratulating him on passage of the Hells Canyon dam bill. pp. 9040-1

5. PERSONNEL. Received from the Government Security Commission a report. p. 9028

Sen. McNamara inserted a statement critical of the report, and an editoria assessing its value. pp. 9041-2

6. AIR POLLUTION. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging full appropriations to aid the States in air pollution abatement and control programs. p. 9029

7. BUDGETING. Received an Ill. Legislature resolution proposing a Constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. p. 9030

8. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Flanders inserted a Vermont Legislature resolution urging repeal of Federal excise taxes on transportation. p. 9031

9. CORN. Sen. Douglas inserted an Ill. House resolution urging enactment of S. J. Res. 105, to make the corn tassel the official floral emblem of the U.S.. p. 9031

10. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Fulbright inserted a report on the damages due to floods in the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins. pp. 9072-5

Sen. Clark inserted an editorial opposing Kinzu Dam on the Allegheny River and then urged passage of the appropriation for the dam despite such opposition. p. 9082

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the Calendar would be called Wed., June 26. He assured Sen. Allott that the Fryingpan-Arkansas project bill would be taken up Thurs., June 27, if possible. pp. 9076-7

12. RECESSED until Wed., June 26. p. 9096

HOUSE

13. WHEAT. Rep. McGovern commented on the wheat referendum vote, stating that "wheat producers make it amply clear that an important segment of agriculture has once again, firmly and convincingly endorsed the principle of effective crop production controls in return for a decent price." p. 9098

14. SOIL BANK. Rep. Udall criticized the operation of the acreage reserve part of the soil bank program, citing figures to indicate large payments received by some farmers for placing land in the soil bank. pp. 9141-42

15. FARM PROGRAM. Reps. Christopher and McCarthy criticized the farm program. pp. 9144-46

16. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS DISPOSAL. Passed with amendment S. 1314, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) for one year, to increase the authorization under Title I from $3 billion to $4 billion, and to authorize $300 million additional under Title II for famine relief. The amendment substituted the language of H.R. 6974 as passed by the House June 24. p. 9119

17. WHEAT. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 6784, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm. p. D568

18. PROPERTY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 2259, to provide for the conveyance of a small tract of FHA land in Prairie Co., Ark., to private individuals (H. Rept. 622). p. 9156

19. ADVISORY COMMITTEES. The Government Operations Committee filed a supplemental report on H.R. 7390, to amend the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 so as to require reports to Congress prior to the establishment of certain advisory committees (H. Rept. 576, pt. 2). p. 9155

20. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported S. J. Res. 39, to authorize the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex. (H. Rept. 609). p. 9155

21. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.R. 7520, to authorize the sale to the village of Central, N. Mex., of certain lands administered by the Forest Service which were formerly a part of the Ft. Bayard Military Reservation (H. Rept. 621). p. 9156

22. SECURITY. Received the report of the Commission on Government Security pursuant to Public Law 786, 84th Congress. p. 9155

23. RESEARCH. Rep. Dixon commended the work of the President's Bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, and reviewed the outstanding features of the report of the Commission. pp. 9152-55

24. CONTRACTS. Passed without amendment H.R. 7168, to prescribe policies and procedures for construction contracts made by executive agencies. pp. 9134-41

25. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Lanham criticized State Department actions under the Trade Agreements Act, and charged it was trying to usurp the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to determine tariff rates. pp. 9142-43

26. ATOMIC ENERGY. Passed with amendments S. 2243, to provide congressional review of Atomic Energy Commission determinations which affect the civilian reactor power program. A similar bill, H.R. 7992, was laid on the table. pp. 9126-33

SENATE (Continued)

27. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL. The Senate committee inserted a provision in this bill, H.R. 5189, which is described in the committee report as follows:

"During the course of the hearings it was brought to the attention of the committee that the trust territory was not eligible to receive surplus foods from the Department of Agriculture, and that there was a need in the schools and hospitals for certain types of foods that the Department of Agriculture has available. Therefore, the committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to place the trust territory in the same status as States, Territories, and possessions in receiving such surplus foods."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

28. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Neuberger inserted a speech, "A Basis for the Total Development of Waters in the Northwest," concerned with the wise and fullest use of our water resources. pp. A4996-7

29. BUDGETING. Sen. Kennedy inserted several editorials favoring S. 434, a bill to implement a basic reform recommended by the Hoover Commission, which would bring about important improvements in our budgeting and accounting procedures. pp. A5001-2

30. SECURITY. Sen. Case, N.J., inserted 2 editorials regarding the report of the Commission on Government Security, and stated "this is a most important one, and the comments of these two distinguished publications point up some of the major considerations." pp. A5003-4

31. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Bentley inserted Eugene W. Castle's address, "More Yankee Trade, Less Foreign Aid," which included statements that the amount in this Department's budget for foreign aid should be included in the total foreign aid bill, and that "moreover, foreign currency received from these food sales spells trouble..." pp. A5007-9

Rep. Fulton inserted testimony presented before the House Foreign Affairs Committee showing the working of the 1958 program for humanitarian purposes in conjunction with mutual security legislation. p. A5034

32. FORESTRY. Sen. Bennett inserted an article, "Why I Am Opposed to the Wilderness Preservation Bill." Sen. Bennett stated that "we resist attempts...to stifle future development of our water resources, our mining resources, our livestock industry, and our lumber industry, through a rigid program which will not serve the best interests of the general public."

33. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Yarborough inserted a report relating how a great multiple-purpose dam can be built by the combined efforts of men of vision. pp. A4998-9

Extension of remarks of Rep. Van Zandt discussing advances which have been made toward creating electric current through atomic energy and inserting an article, "Atomic Power Development Slowed By Cheaper Sources of Electricity--United States Utilities Probe Use of H-Bomb." pp. A5016-7

34. FAMILY FARM. Rep. Huddleston inserted his recent address before the Ala. Ass'n of County Agricultural Agents, "The Small Farmer's Battle for Survival." pp. A5037-9

35. STATEHOOD. Del. Burns inserted an index of congressional hearings on statehood for Hawaii. p. A5040

36. RECLAMATION. Rep. Horan inserted an editorial, "Reclamation Pays Its Way," pointing up the value of reclamation. pp. A5045-6

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to assure both Senators that we shall do our best to accommodate them, and we shall try to bring up that matter on Thursday.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana; and the people of Colorado will also be very appreciative of having this matter taken care of.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WHEAT PRODUCERS FROM LIABILITY UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and the Senate proceed to the consideraiton of Calendar No. 465, Senate bill 959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Calendar No. 465, Senate bill 959, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask a question of the acting majority leader: Does he intend to have the Senate consider immediately thereafter Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 606? The Department of Agriculture believes that the enactment of Senate bill 606 will be needed in any event; and most farm organizations believe that the two bills should have been joined. If one of the bills is to be passed, I believe the other one should be passed immediately thereafter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the first notice we have heard about that particular measure. I wish to assure the Senator from North Dakota that it will be given every possible consideration. But we have been asked to have Calendar No. 465, Senate bill 959, considered at this time.

Mr. YOUNG. I think I shall have to object, because the understanding of the Department of Agriculture is that the provisions of Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 606, are very important if Calendar No. 465, Senate bill 959, is passed. As one who has favored the wheat bill, I do not believe there should be a separation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the minority leader, it is agreeable to have both bills brought up at the same time. However, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 465, Senate bill 959, be taken up first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to explain the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill would exempt excess wheat from marketing penalties if the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or food on the farm where grown. It would be retroactive to the 1954 crop. Except for retroactivity and provisions with respect to food use, the first section of the bill is identical to S. 46, which passed the Senate in 1955.

Section 2, which would be added by the committee amendment, would amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act to permit farmers who obtain exemptions from marketing penalties under the bill to qualify for payments under the acreage reserve programs for other commodities and the conservation reserve program. Section 114 disqualifies farmers who exceed their allotments from eligibility to receive any payments under the Soil Bank Act. Since farmers obtaining exemption would be permitted to exceed their allotments, they should not be penalized for so doing.

Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment to the bill, which I call up and offer at this time on behalf of the committee; and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

If any producer on the farm votes in any referendum under section 336, beginning with the referendum applicable to the 1959 crop, no producer on the farm shall be eligible for exemption under this section with respect to the crop to which such referendum is applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of the committee.

Section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 restricts the wheat marketing quota referendum to farmers who will be subject to the quota. Farmers who obtain exemption under the bill should, therefore, not be permitted to vote in the referendum. However, the referendum is held before application for exemption is likely to be required. The committee therefore included in the report a recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture that he require farmers to elect, at the time of the referendum, whether they will vote in the referendum or will maintain their eligibility for exemption under the bill. This recommendation is set out on page 2 of the report.

The committee also directed the committee staff to discuss this recommendation with lawyers for the Department of Agriculture, so that an appropriate amendment could be offered when the bill was considered by the Senate, if such amendment was determined to be necessary to carry out the committee's recommendation. While the committee's intention probably would be carried out in any event, it was agreed that the adoption of the amendment I am now offering would be advisable to assure that result. The amendment provides that if any producer on the farm votes in the referendum, no producer on the farm would be eligible for exemption.

Siince the referendum for the 1958 crop was held on June 20, this provision would become effective with the 1959 crop.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. First, I should like to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for reporting the bill.

As the Senator from Delaware will recall, earlier in the session I submitted, as an amendment to another agricultural bill, a bill of this nature. At that time, as a result of the statements made by the members of the committee, we did not press for the adoption of that amendment because of the assurance that the committee would report the bill which now is before the Senate.

I also wish to state that I think the amendment the Senator from Delaware has called up is a just one. Certainly a farmer should not be allowed to vote in the referendum if he is not going to come under the provisions of the act. Many farmers in my State who have grown an amount of wheat just a little bit over the limitation have been prosecuted, and fines have been levied. I know that such action, if continued, would be a real blow to free agriculture. So I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware and his committee for reporting the bill to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Michigan. It is true that at that time the committee had before it a similar bill, which had been introduced by the Senator from Michigan, and also a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Those bills were along the same line.

As the Senator from Michigan has stated, this bill provides that a farmer can raise and feed his own wheat without being subject to any penalties, but at the same time if a farmer chooses to take advantage of this provision, he cannot use his acreage as a means of qualifying himself to vote in a referendum on wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report on S. 959 be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 458) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would exempt excess wheat from marketing penalties if the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or food on the farm where grown. It would be retroactive to cover the 1954, 1955, and 1956 crops, as well as future crops. If exemptions were obtained on the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crops, penalties paid on such crops would be refunded; wheat stored to avoid such penalties would be released from storage; and the Secretary would pay producers the value of any wheat delivered to him to avoid such pen-

alties. Except for retroactivity and provisions with respect to food use, the first section of the bill is identical to S. 46, which passed the Senate in 1955, and is substantially the same as S. 403, S. 658, and S. 901 introduced by Senators WATKINS, BYRD, and POTTER, respectively. The substance of this provision was also included in an amendment offered by Senator POTTER to S. 1771 earlier this year.

Section 2, which would be added by the committee amendment, would amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act to permit farmers who obtain exemptions from marketing penalties under the first section of the bill to qualify for payments under the acreage reserve programs for other commodities and the conservation reserve program, even though they exceed their wheat acreage allotments. (Sec. 114 disqualifies farmers who exceed their allotments from eligibility to receive any payments under the Soil Bank Act.)

The bill and the committee amendment are further explained in the attached letters from the Department of Agriculture.

Section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 restricts the marketing quota referendum to farmers who will be subject to the quota, and producers exempt under the bill would therefore not be eligible to vote. The Secretary should, by appropriate regulation, require producers to elect whether they will vote in the referendum or maintain their eligibility for an exemption under the bill. Applications from producers for exemption should not be approved after they have elected, by voting in the referendum, to remain subject to quotas. Since exemptions are made on a farm basis, the Secretary may provide that the election of any producer on the farm to remain subject to quotas. Since exemptions are made on a farm basis, the Secretary may provide that the election of any producer on the farm to remain subject to the quota shall prevent the exemption from being granted for the farm. The requirement that producers make an election as to whether they will vote in the referendum or maintain their eligibility for an exemption should, of course, only be made applicable to referendums held with respect to the 1959 and subsequent crops.

The exemption provided by the bill is restricted to farms which consume all of the wheat they produce and introduce no wheat into commerce. The exemption is null and void if the conditions upon which it is granted are not met, and the entire crop would be subject to the penalty provisions of the act if even the smallest quantity should be removed from the farm contrary to the provisions of the bill. It is expected that the Secretary would take special care to see that the conditions of exemption are fulfilled and that the amount of wheat moving in commerce is not increased by any wheat produced on farms exempted under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 959) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delievered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this act;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions."

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm-acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat-acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

If any producer on the farm votes in any referendum under section 336, beginning with the referendum applicable to the 1959 crop, no producer on the farm shall be eligible for exemption under this section with respect to the crop to which such referendum is applicable.

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat-acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or."

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was called off the floor of the Senate when the Senate passed Calendar No. 465, S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act when all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm.

I certainly would not move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, but I wish to make a short statement.

I appreciate very much the report from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which accompanied the bill. I think the bill is a timely one. It exempts from penalties farmers who plant wheat for home use on their own farms. It should have been passed years ago. As a matter of fact, many farmers have been penalized in the Federal courts and fined because of small violations amounting to an excess of 3 or 5 acres, in the marketing quotas established for their counties.

I have in my hand a list of cases filed in the United States district court in Kansas by the United States attorney for 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957. As I read the bill, the provision with respect to penalty payments will be retroactive, and, where penalties have been collected, will be refunded. Cases which are pending, if the bill becomes law, will be removed from the docket. This is very timely proposed legislation, and I appreciate the fact that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short statement from the President's message to the Congress of January 9, 1956, and also a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its 38th annual meeting at Miami Beach, Fla., on December 13, 1956, regarding this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the extract from the President's message and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the President's message to the Congress of January 9, 1956, he stated as follows:

"Legislation already has passed the Senate and is pending in the House of Representatives which would exempt from marketing quotas those producers who use for feed, food, or seed on their own farms all the wheat they raise. Because of the failure to pass this legislation last year the Department of Agriculture has been compelled by law to hail before the courts farmers whose only offense was to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas. Again the administration urges prompt enactment of this legislation. Correction of this problem should be delayed no longer."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION AT THE 38TH ANNUAL MEETING, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., DECEMBER 13, 1956

FEED WHEAT

We recommend legislation to exempt from wheat-marketing quotas if all wheat produced thereon is used only as food, feed, or seed on the farm where grown or on farms under the same operation. Produc-

ers taking advantage of this exemption should not be eligible to participate in any price-support program for wheat or other feed grains, and all wheat producers affected by marketing quotas should be eligible to vote thereon. Such legislation should be substituted for the present 15 acre and 200 bushel wheat-marketing quota exemptions.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I just heard the Senator's remarks with respect to S. 959. I also was called off the floor, and when I returned to the floor the bill had been passed. I had stepped out for a few moments. I am not going to ask for its reconsideration. I certainly desire to associate myself with the remarks of Senator from Kansas has made. I think it is high time such a bill was passed. A number of wheat growers in my State have been penalized. I am sure such legislation will prevent such events in the future.

As a matter of fact, in some sections of my State the kind of wheat which is ordinarily sold on the wheat markets of the country is not grown. The wheat is used largely for feed. Occasionally the farmers grow a few acres of millable wheat. By reason of the provisions of the law it has been very difficult for these farmers to operate. They have been penalized, or threatened with penalties, even in areas which suffered severe drought, because they were using some of the wheat to feed animals which were in need of food.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks following the passage of the bill a statement which I had prepared and which I had intended to deliver.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

I urge the Senate to pass S. 959. Section 1 of this bill would (1) exempt excess wheat from marketing quota penalties if the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or food on the farm where grown; (2) refund such penalties on the 1954, 1955, and 1956 crops if such entire crop of wheat was used for feed, seed, or food.

This section of the bill, as the report makes clear, "is substantially the same as S. 403" which I introduced on January 9, 1957. My action in introducing S. 403 was prompted by a genuine concern for the welfare of livestock producers in deficit feed producing areas such as the Intermountain and New England States, where livestock, poultry, and dairy production are the major agricultural activities.

Section 1 of S. 959 will serve to alleviate much of the economic distress producers in these areas have been and are experiencing. In some of these States, drought conditions not only have reduced local feed production, which at best cannot meet local needs, but also have served to raise retail feed prices. Producers who have not adequate financial resources simply cannot make ends meet even in spite of the USDA's feed grain subsidy program. In other States, rising costs of production and marketing, especially transportation, when coupled with continued increase in livestock numbers in the "basic commodities" producing areas of the country, in spite of the soil bank, have resulted in market prices way below parity.

For example, in May 1956, eggs were bringing producers 89 percent of parity; in May 1957, average prices received by producers had declined 23 points to 66 percent of parity. During the corresponding period, the average prices received index declined (1) 7 points for lambs; (2) 17 points for turkeys; (3) 8 points for chickens; and (4) 1 point for sheep. As of May 15, 1957, the average prices received as percentages of parity prices for (1) cattle stood at 78 percent of parity; (2) calves at 76 percent of parity; and (3) hogs at 79 percent of parity.

As these data indicate, if any part of agriculture has been hard hit by the cost-price squeeze, it has been the livestock and poultry industries. Passage of S. 959 will provide some measure of relief to these industries. On the other hand, its passage will not adversely affect, materially, the welfare of commercial wheat producers, since the wheat produced under the exemption features of this bill will not find its way into commercial trade channels nor will it end up under price support.

By way of illustration, let me point out that whereas farmers in my own State of Utah produced over 6.5 million bushels of wheat in 1954, less than 8 percent of it was placed under price support.

In many of the deficit feed-producing States which are designated as being in the "commercial wheat area" acreage allotments are very small. With respect to 1954, the only year such data is available, the USDA reported that of 12,163 farms which produced wheat in Utah, for example, only 1,313 had wheat acreage over 100 acres, 2,993 had acreages between 16 and 100 acres, and 7,857 had acreage below 16 acres. Utah farmers derive only 6.4 percent of their income from wheat production, and although it qualifies as a commercial-wheat State, because Utah farmers produce more than 25,000 acres of wheat, it plainly is not a major commercial-wheat-producing State. On the other hand, Utah farmers derive a major portion of their income from livestock products, as follows: 22.5 percent from beef cattle and calves, 16.8 percent from dairy products, 8.8 percent from eggs, and 7.7 percent from turkeys. Most of the grains produced, including wheat, are fed to livestock; they are not sold in commercial trade.

In general, what is true of Utah's agriculture is also true of the agriculture of many other States in the intermountain and New England areas, and other parts of the country as well. Authority for farmers in such areas to produce wheat for feed without penalty on their farms would be of material assistance under prevailing economic conditions.

Historically, wheat used for livestock was a significant proportion of our annual wheat crop. For many reasons, this is no longer true. But the fact remains, as the President noted in his January 1956 special agricultural message, "there are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas distant from the Corn Belt."

This point of view is substantiated by a letter dated January 21, 1957, to me from Mr. David H. Jones, former Utah commissioner of agriculture. In part, this letter reads:

"I want to congratulate you on your fine thinking and the action you have taken to remove the restrictions on wheat acreage where extra wheat is needed for feed or seed purposes. We in the State of Utah really import grains for feeding purposes, and the bill should prove to be a worthy one.

"In my own farming experience, I never sold grain off the farm. I found there was no equal to wheat mixed with other grains for livestock feed. I am certain it will be a fine thing to have Senate bill 403 passed, and it should benefit many people."

Similar concern was expressed to me in a letter also dated January 21, 1957, from Mr. Ralph Blackham, a director of the executive council of the Utah Council of Farmer Cooperatives. In part Mr. Blackham wrote:

"I am very much in favor of the passage of * * * S. 403, and I appreciate more than I can say your action in instituting this legislation. Farmers in the intermountain area who feed livestock or poultry have been put to an increasing disadvantage the past several years for two reasons: high Government price supports and reduced acreage allotments on wheat, and rapidly increasing freight rates on all feed."

Typical of the reactions I have received from producers to S. 403, which substantially was incorporated as section 1 of S. 959, was that of Mr. Zelph S. Calder, of Vernal, Utah. His letter of February 5, 1957, reads in part as follows:

"I read with interest and approval press comments to the effect you were entering a bill in Congress which would allow a farmer to feed his excess wheat to his cattle without paying a penalty on it.

"The following example might be of help to you.

"Last year I produced about 6,000 bushels of wheat and fed and pastured 200 stocker cattle that I bought last spring. The local USDA wheat-allotment office declared October 31, 1956, that I had excess wheat in the amount of 2,780 bushels and that if the penalty of $1.07 per bushel was not paid on the wheat stored and bonded by November 15, 1956, I would have to pay the above penalty on the 6,000 bushels. (I was and now am of the opinion that I did not have an excess acreage because of winter-killed and volunteer wheat acreage counted by the said office.)

"Uintah County was declared last fall a drought disaster area. I could not qualify for the $1.50 per cut subsidy given by the Government in this area on grain fed to cattle because I had wheat and because I had stocker and feeder cattle, notwithstanding I had suffered greater loss due to the drought than my neighbor who had breeding cattle."

The Congress to date has given very little attention to pleas for relief from such livestock producers. Other than a few direct purchase or surplus removal programs, which more often than not have had very little price-boosting effect, livestock producers have received little assistance. Passage of S. 959 will help a great many farmers and ranchers in the nonbasic commodity producing areas of this country.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is always watching after the interests of the farmers not only in the State of Utah but in the Nation. I am in thorough accord with the Senator's statement that this is timely legislation. It is pretty hard to go to a farmer and tell him he cannot grow wheat for feed on his own farm. That has been the situation in the past. This bill, if enacted, should correct it. I am very happy about it.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. I wish to point out that many poultry producers in my State have been heavily penalized because of the situation as it exists under the present law. When the bill, amending the law, has been finally passed by both Houses, I think that situation will be largely corrected. I think they will be very grateful to those who have reported the bill and had it passed by the Senate.

TRANSFER OF WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be again temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 606.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 606, to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 606) to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or other agency having the right of eminent domain, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (c) the word "three" immediately preceding the words "marketing years" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four"; (2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) two new sentences reading as follows: "Any acreage planted to wheat in excess of the 1958 and subsequent farm acreage allotments shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The planting on the farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm under the first sentence of this subsection."; and (3) by changing subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the acreage allotment established, or which would have been established, for a farm which is removed from agricultural production in 1954 or thereafter because of acquisition by any Federal, State, or other agency having a right of eminent domain shall be placed in an allotment pool and shall be used only to establish equitable allotments for other farms owned or acquired by the owner of the farm so acquired by such agency: *Provided*, That such owner makes application therefor within 3 years after the end of the calendar year in which such farm was removed from agricultural production: *Provided further*, That the allotment so made for any farm, including a farm on which wheat has not been planted during any of the 4 marketing years preceding the marketing year in which the allotment is made, after taking into consideration the acreage allotment which was placed in the pool from the farm acquired from the applicant, shall compare with the allotments established for other farms in the same locality which are similar except for the past acreage of wheat."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, starting with page 2, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report—No. 459—was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE

The report of the Department of Agriculture suggested an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was subsequently modified pursuant to suggestions of Department spokesmen and is recommended by your committee. The substitute would make the following changes in the wheat marketing quota law:

First, it would give "old" farm status to farms on which wheat has been produced during any of the previous 4, instead of 3, marketing years. (At least 97 percent of the State wheat acreage allotment must be apportioned to "old" farms.) This change would give recognition to crop rotation systems, well established in certain areas, under which wheat is planted once each 4 years.

Second, it would prohibit wheat planted in excess of 1958 and subsequent allotments from counting as history for future State, county, or farm allotments, and would prohibit wheat planted to 1958 or subsequent crops in the absence of allotments from giving any farm "old" farm status. Provisions preventing excess acreage from counting as history are now applicable to the other basic commodities, except corn, and a provision preventing plantings in the absence of allotments from giving old farm status is applicable to tobacco; 563,000 wheat farms overplanted their wheat allotments in 1956. About 95 percent of these planted less than 15 acres and were exempt from quotas. Crediting these farms with their overplanted acreage results in a shift of allotments from farms which complied with their allotments and a shift from the large wheat farm areas to small wheat farm areas.

Third, it would amend the provision pooling allotments of farms acquired by the United States for national defense purposes to—

(a) Extend it to farms acquired for any purpose of any agency having a right of eminent domain;

(b) Restrict it to farms removed from agricultural production in 1954 or thereafter on account of such acquisition;

(c) Permit allotment to other farms from the pool only if application is made within 3 years after the end of the calendar year in which the original farm was removed from production; and

(d) Require the acreage placed in the pool to be taken into account in fixing the acreage allotted to any farm from the pool.

The pooling provision proposed in the committee amendment differs from that proposed in the bill as introduced in that (1) it eliminates a provision applicable to farms acquired for national defense purposes since 1950 on the ground that no wheat farms have been so acquired since 1950; (2) it clarifies the cutoff date on the period within which application for allotment from the pool must be made; and (3) it makes a technical change to reflect the proposed change in the definition of old wheat farms.

MODIFICATIONS OF DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department's report on the bill included a suggestion that allotments be apportioned on the basis of 5-, instead of 10-, year seeded acreages. Since it made this recommendation, the Department determined that the acreage planted in excess of allotments during recent years was such that this suggestion would result in a substantial shift of allotments to areas of noncompliance. The Department consequently withdrew this recommendation. Department spokesmen also suggested that the allotment pooling provision suggested by the Department be modified by (1) striking out the words "in 1955 or thereafter" where they appeared after the words "because of acquisition"; and (2) inserting the words "in 1954 or thereafter" before the words "because of acquisition." Use of 1954 is preferable to 1955 in order to cover the situation as fully as possible. (Wheat acreage allotments were not in effect in the years prior to 1954 so that the Department does not have adequate data to extend the provision prior to 1954.) This modification would also make pooling effective at the time of removal of the farm from agricultural production rather than the time of acquisition, since frequently farms continue in production after acquisition by an agency having the right of eminent domain.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., April 5, 1957.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 16 for a report on S. 606, a bill to permit the transfer of wheat acreage allotments of lands taken by any Federal, State, or any other agency having the right of eminent domain.

This Department recommends the enactment of this bill, modified as indicated below.

This bill would amend subsection 334 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to extend the so-called Barden amendment for wheat to include acquisitions of farms made for any purpose in 1956 or thereafter by any Federal, State, or other agency having a right of eminent domain. In addition, the bill would limit to 3 years the period in which a dispossessed farm owner could apply for an adjustment in the wheat allotment determined for other farms owned or acquired by him. Under existing legislation the Barden amendment is limited to Federal acquisition for national-defense purposes beginning with 1950. The inclusion of such earlier date in the modified amendment is not necessary since there have been no acquisitions for national-defense purposes during the period 1950 to the present time.

We believe that the objective of this amendment could best be achieved by changing the language therein to read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the acreage allotment established or which would have been established for a farm which is removed from agricultural production because of acquisition in 1955 or thereafter by any Federal, State, or other agency having a right of eminent domain shall be placed in an allotment pool and shall be used only to establish equitable allotments for other farms owned or acquired by the owner of the farm so acquired by such agency: *Provided*, That such owner shall make application therefor within 3 years after the end of the calendar year in which such farm was removed from agricultural production: *Provided further*, That the allotment so made for any farm, including a farm on which wheat has not been planted during any of the 4 marketing years preceding the marketing year in which the allotment is made, after taking into consideration the allotment acreage which was placed in the pool from the farm acquired from the applicant, shall compare with the allotments established for other farms in the same locality which are similar except for the past acreage of wheat.

The principal changes made by this revised language are (1) the elimination of the 1950 date for reasons explained above; (2) clarification of the cutoff date within which a dispossessed farm owner must apply for an adjusted allotment under the amendment; and (3) change the definition of an

S. 959

AN ACT

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 25, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

under section 336, beginning with the referendum applicable to the 1959 crop, no producer on the farm shall be eligible for exemption under this section with respect to the crop to which such referendum is applicable.

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or".

Passed the Senate June 24 (legislative day, June 21), 1957.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 959

AN ACT

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

JUNE 25, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

H. R. 8456

A BILL

S. 959

AN ACT

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8456

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however*, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the pro-

visions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this Act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future national, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsec-

tion (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (e) and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That any State in which for three successive years the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain exceeds 35,000 acres, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area and the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State in such three years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided further,* That any State placed in the commercial wheat producing area under the foregoing proviso shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State is less than 25,000 acres for three consecutive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area if he determines that such designation would permit more efficient administration of this Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949."

SEC. 4. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or".

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8456

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANFUSO

JULY 1, 1957
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 16, 1957
For actions of July 15, 1957
85th-1st, No. 124

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill to exempt from quotas certain wheat used on farm where produced. House passed compulsory poultry inspection bill. House passed bill to remove green peanuts from marketing penalties. House debated mutual security authorization bill. Sen. Morse criticized REA reductions. Rep. Staggers criticized Department's proposed changes in ACP programs. Rep. Avery commended Ass't Secretary Peterson's leadership in soil and water conservation programs. Rep. Hiestand introduced and discussed bill for greater coordination of Federal loan programs and fiscal and credit policies.

HOUSE

1. POULTRY. Passed with amendment, under suspension of the rules, S. 1747, to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products by this Department. This bill will now be returned to the Senate for consideration of the amendment to the bill. (This bill replaces a similar bill, H.R. 6814, passed by the House on July 9. See Digest 119). pp. 10577-83

2. PEANUTS. Passed as reported H.R. 6570, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to remove green peanuts from the marketing penalty provisions. p. 10568

3. WHEAT. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.R. 8456, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm. p. 10637

4. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on S. 2130, the mutual security authorization bill, after adopting a resolution waiving all points of order against the bill. pp. 10593-615, 10627-36

5. MEATS. Passed over, on objections by Reps. Weaver, Byrnes, Wisc., and Marshall, H.R. 7244, to permit deductions for a self-help meat promotion program. p. 10568

6. BUDGETING. Passed over, on objections by Reps. Bow, Brown, Ohio, and Ford, H.R. 6900, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to enable the Comptroller General to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget. p. 10563

Passed over, on objections by Reps. Ford, Taber, and Horan, H.R. 8002, to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. p. 10568

7. OLEOMARGARINE. Passed over, on objection by Rep. Byrnes, Wisc., H.R. 912, to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine. p. 10569

8. PUBLIC LANDS. Passed over, on objection by Rep. Heselton, H.R. 8054, to provide for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in lands beneath inland navigable waters in Alaska. pp. 10572-73

9. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment S. 977, to suspend and modify the application of the excess land provision of the Federal reclamation laws to lands in the E. Bench unit of the Mo. River Basin project. A similar bill, H.R. 4410, was laid on the table. (p. 10574) This bill will now be sent to the President.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment, S. 1482, to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act so as to increase the limitation on the acreage one family might have of irrigated land (H. Rept. 810). p. 10637

10. CIVIL DEFENSE. Passed without amendment H.R. 7576, to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 so as to permit the expansion of the civil-defense activity of the Federal Government to assume more responsibility for the national program. pp. 10583-90

11. NATURAL RESOURCES. Rep. Pfost inserted a newspaper editorial discussing the natural resource policies of the Administration for the development of the resources of U.S. as compared with expenditures for the development of the resources of foreign countries. pp. 10620-21

12. PERSONNEL. Rep. Staggers spoke in favor of pay raises for Federal employees. pp. 10626-27

SENATE

13. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse criticized private electric utilities and charged they were trying to cripple REA programs. He urged an expanded REA program to aid in full development of rural areas. pp. 10563-4

S. 2406, to authorize construction of improvement works on the Niagara River, remained the Senate's pending business. p. 10515

14. FORESTRY. The Senate concurred in the House amendment to S. 44, to authorize the Secretary to exchange lands in the Apache National Forest, N.M. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 10559

Sen. Humphrey inserted an editorial urging enactment of S. 1176, to establish a national wilderness preservation system. pp. 10488-9

15. WATER CONSERVATION. Sen. Watkins announced the first water flow in the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District and explained the history of the project. pp. 10513-14

85TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 813

WHEAT FOR ON-FARM CONSUMPTION

JULY 15, 1957.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8456]

The Committee on Agriculture to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill is to exempt from marketing quotas up to 30 acres of wheat on any farm when all of the wheat produced is used on the farm for feed, seed, or human food. The bill also makes compensating adjustments in the wheat-acreage allotment and marketing-quota laws to minimize the effect of the exempted acreage and production on the regular wheat program.

The laws relating to wheat-marketing quotas now provide that any farmer (whether he has an acreage allotment or not) may grow up to 15 acres of wheat without becoming subject to marketing quotas and the penalties connected therewith. It is the only marketing-quota program which provides any such exception. In all of the other programs (cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco) no production in excess of marketing quotas is permitted without penalty. The wheat laws were also recently amended to establish commercial and noncommercial wheat areas. States with acreage allotments of less than 25,000 acres are in the noncommercial area and in such States there are no farm-acreage allotments or marketing quotas, and thus no limitation on the amount of wheat any individual farmer may produce.

In spite of these exemptions in the existing wheat marketing quota laws, there has been a growing demand in recent years to exempt from marketing quotas and their penalty provisions all of the wheat grown on farms where the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or human food on the farm. In general, this demand for relaxation for wheat marketing quotas has come from the feed-deficit areas of the eastern and northeastern part of the United States and specifically from producers of poultry and milk. These demands have been stoutly resisted by producers in the main commercial-wheat-growing areas, as a further weakening of their already liberal marketing quota laws and a possible threat to the very existence of the wheat marketing quota program.

Several bills on this subject were referred to the committee in the 84th Congress and hearings were held on this proposal in both the 1st and 2d sessions of that Congress. In each case, committee action was unfavorable, chiefly because of the effect on the wheat marketing quota program which was feared from the proposed relaxation of the marketing-quota provisions.

Early in the 85th Congress, numerous bills on this subject were again introduced in the House and referred to this committee. In the main, these bills were identical with or very similar to bills on the same subject which had been disapproved by this committee in the 84th Congress. Rather than proceeding to hearing on these bills, therefore, the chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee collaborated with the author of the bill, H. R. 6784, in working out a bill which would provide the exemption sought by milk and poultry producers and other farmers and, at the same time, afford a larger measure of protection to the regular wheat program and include provisions to minimize the effect of the proposed exemptions.

After numerous conferences with wheat producers, Department of Agriculture officials, representatives of the dairy and poultry industries, and Members of Congress interested in this subject the bill, H. R. 6784, was introduced by Mr. Anfuso on April 10, 1957 and hearings were held on June 19, 20, and 21, 1957.

HEARINGS

Witnesses at the hearings included spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture, the major farm organizations, wheat-producer organizations, and Members of Congress from the milk- and poultry-producing areas of the country. The witnesses were virtually unanimous in their endorsement of the bill. Some of them felt that it did not go far enough in granting exemptions for this purpose but stated that it was a step in the right direction and endorsed the specific provisions of the bill. The wheat producers expressed themselves as still opposed to this type of legislation and feared its effect on their wheat-quota program but stated that they were in agreement with some of the provisions of the bill and that, if such legislation were to be enacted, H. R. 6784 was preferable to any other bill.

As the result of the hearings, certain amendments to the bill were adopted (including those recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its letter endorsing the legislation). The amended bill was approved by the full committee and a clean bill, embodying the subcommittee amendments, was ordered introduced and that bill (H. R. 8456) is reported favorably herewith.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1

Section 1 of the bill amends the wheat marketing quota laws to provide that beginning with the 1958 crop of wheat any producer may, upon proper application to the county committee, obtain exemption from the penalty provisions of the wheat marketing quota laws for the planting on his farm of up to 30 acres of wheat in the event that all of the wheat produced on the farm is used thereon for feed, seed, or human food, and that none of such wheat is disposed of in any other manner.

Paragraph (1) provides that the total acreage of wheat grown on any farm claiming an exemption under this act cannot exceed 30 acres. This acreage limitation will not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions, but all of the other conditions set out in this section do apply to such farms.

Paragraphs (2) and (3) provide that none of the wheat which is produced under the exemption authorized by this section may be removed from the farm except for processing as human food or livestock feed and that the entire crop of wheat produced under an exemption must be consumed on the farm, within the crop year, by the producer claiming the exemption or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm. The stipulation against exchanging any of the crop for goods or services or selling any part of the crop will prevent "toll milling" operations in which the miller retains a portion of the product in return for his services in grinding the wheat into feed or flour. This means that if wheat is removed from the farm for grinding into feed or flour, the entire product of that wheat must be returned to the farm and must be consumed there. None of it may be retained by the miller for any purpose. It also means that no part of any crop of wheat grown under the exemption herein provided may be sold to anyone, for any purpose. Paragraph (3) also means that the entire crop must be consumed on the farm within the crop year. None of it may be stored and carried over into a new crop year.

Failure to comply with any of these conditions or with any of the regulations prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) will cause the exemption to become immediately null and void and the producer to become liable for payment of marketing-quota penalties under the regular provisions of the wheat marketing quota law unless the Secretary determines that the failure to comply with the conditions is due to circumstances beyond the producer's control.

The section provides that no acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm-acreage allotment under the exemption herein provided shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for the farm. It also provides that no producer who takes advantage of this exemption from the wheat marketing quota laws will be eligible to vote in the referendum on the adoption of quotas with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat.

It is to be noted that the exemption authorized by this section does not change in any way the existing provisions of law with respect to the 15-acre exemption now authorized in the wheat marketing quota laws. If this bill becomes law, a producer may still take advantage of the 15-acre exemption now authorized by law, or he may take ad-

vantage of the exemption authorized by this section—but he cannot do both. The provisions are mutually exclusive. A farmer who plants less than 15 acres of wheat is not subject to the wheat marketing quota laws and he may dispose of the wheat in any manner he sees fit. Any farmer who grows more than 15 acres of wheat is subject to the marketing-quota laws unless he has obtained the exemption provided in this section, in which event he cannot sell any of that crop of wheat and is subject to all the other conditions stipulated in this bill.

Section 2

Section 2 provides that beginning with the 1958 crop, wheat planted in excess of acreage allotments will not be counted in establishing future acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage will not be counted either for acreage allotment and marketing-quota purposes or in determining the level of price support. This provision will apply to all types of planting in excess of allotments—exemptions under this bill, plantings within the 15-acre exemption, and ordinary plantings in excess of acreage allotments to which a penalty provision applies. The only exception to this general rule is in the case of a State which is reclassified from noncommercial to commercial under the provisions of section 3 of the bill. In such instances, the acreage seeded to wheat within the State will be counted in determining acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Section 3

Section 335 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, provides for designation by the Secretary of commercial and noncommercial wheat producing States and provides that any State with an acreage allotment of less than 25,000 acres may be designated by the Secretary as outside the commercial wheat-producing area. In such a State, there are no individual farm-acreage allotments or marketing quotas and producers within that State are free to produce and market wheat without respect to either acreage allotments or marketing quotas but are not eligible for any price support.

With the national wheat allotment now at the statutory minimum and no increase in the national allotment anticipated for some years to come, the acreage allotments for the States classified as outside the commercial area are unlikely to show any appreciable increase in size no matter what the actual plantings of wheat within the State may be. In the case of some noncommercial States this increase in plantings has been substantial. For example, 1 State with an acreage allotment of slightly more than 6,000 acres planted 90,000 acres of wheat in 1957. Another with an acreage allotment of about 16,000 acres planted 150,000 acres in 1957.

Section 3 of the bill amends this obvious deficiency in the existing law respecting commercial and noncommercial wheat States by providing that where a State for 3 successive years plants an acreage to wheat for harvest as grain in excess of 35,000 acres it shall be classified as a commercial wheat State and shall remain in that classification unless plantings in the State drop to less than 25,000 acres for 3 successive years and the Secretary determines that it would permit more efficient administration of the wheat program to again remove the State from the commercial category.

Section 4

Section 4 is a clarifying amendment to the Soil Bank Act to make it clear that a farmer who obtains an exemption from the wheat marketing quota provisions under section 1 of this bill and thereafter plants wheat in excess of his acreage allotment will not be considered as out of compliance on his wheat acreage for soil-bank purposes. The acreage reserve provisions of the soil bank require that for a producer to be eligible to participate therein, he must not only reduce the acreage of the crop he is placing in the soil bank below his acreage allotment but must be in compliance with respect to all other acreage allotments. In the absence of the amendment made in section 4, a farmer, for example, who had placed cotton acreage in the soil bank and complied with all of the requirements of the soil-bank program would be ruled ineligible to participate in the cotton soil-bank program if he were claiming an exemption under section 1 of this bill and planting wheat on his farm in excess of his acreage allotment. This provision simply will provide that such a farmer will not be ruled ineligible to participate in the soil-bank acreage reserve by virtue of his planting wheat on his farm in excess of his acreage allotment under the provisions of section 1 of this bill.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Following is the letter from the Department of Agriculture approving the provisions of this bill and recommending its enactment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request for a report on H. R. 6784, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all of the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

We believe the bill is a step in the right direction but does not go far enough. We recommend that the exemption of wheat producers from liability under the act, where all of the wheat crop is fed or used on the farm for seed or food, be made applicable without limitation in the same manner as is provided in the proposed legislation for State, religious, or charitable institutions. However, in the absence of obtaining the greater exemption which we request, the Department would favor the enactment of H. R. 6784, with amendments as set forth in this report.

This bill would amend section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to (1) exempt certain wheat producers from marketing-quota penalties with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1957 or subsequent years where all the wheat is fed or used for seed or human food on the farm, and (2) provide that any State in which for 3 successive years the annual acreage

planted to wheat exceeds 35,000 acreas shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area, and that any State placed in the commercial area shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat in such State is less than 25,000 acres for 3 successive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area. The bill would also amend section 334 of the act to provide that no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Under the provisions of section 1 of the bill an exemption would be granted only to those wheat producers who comply with the following conditions: (*a*) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres, excluding farms operated by State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions, (*b*) that none of the wheat is removed from the farm except for processing for use on such farm, (*c*) that the entire crop is used on the farm for seed, human food, or fed to livestock, including poultry, and (*d*) that producers on the farm and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions. Failure to comply with any of such conditions would cause the exemption to become null and void unless such failure was due to circumstances beyond the control of the producer. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm-acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption would be considered in determining subsequent allotments or marketing quotas for the farm. This latter provision is somewhat comparable to a provision in existing legislation for durum wheat which in effect provides that any acreage seeded in 1957 in excess of the original allotment established for the farm shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The Department feels that this section of the bill is very desirable and should be enacted into law.

Section 2 of the bill would (1) prohibit the use of excess wheat acreage in 1958 and subsequent years for historical purposes in determining future State, county, and farm acreage allotments, and (2) prevent farms planting wheat without an allotment in 1958 and subsequent years from becoming eligible for an allotment in the following year as "old" wheat farms. Each of these provisions now apply to tobacco and the first now applies to all basic crops except wheat and corn. Enactment of this section of the bill would do much toward minimizing undesirable shifts in State and county wheat-acreage allotments which are prevalent under the existing provisions of law. The shifting of wheat-allotment acreage from one State to another and from county to county within a State as the result of overplanting farm-wheat allotments is a matter of grave concern to complying producers. Even within counties complying farms must, under existing legislation, give up allotment acreage to cover the excess acreage on noncomplying farms. Unless legislative action is taken to alter this situation, the problem will become greater as we move into the future. We strongly urge the enactment of this section of the bill.

Section 3 of the bill as modified would provide (1) that any State in which the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain exceeds 35,000

acres for 3 successive years shall be deemed to be within the commercial wheat-producing area and the acreage so planted in such 3 years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments, and (2) that any State placed in the commercial area shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State is less than 25,000 acres for 3 successive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as outside the commercial wheat-producing area. This section of the bill was, no doubt, designed to stabilize the commerical area by preventing certain States from moving in and out of such area from 1 year to the next. Under existing legislation the Secretary may designate a State as outside the commercial wheat-producing area only if the allotment for such State is 25,000 acres or less. We believe that the provisions of this section of the bill are necessary in order to stabilize the commercial wheat-producing area in future years and to implement the effective administration of the wheat production adjustment programs.

We recommend that the bill be modified as follows:

(*a*) Insert on line 9 of page 3 the words "as grain" immediately following the words "wheat for harvest,"

(*b*) Insert on line 24 of page 3 the words "for harvest as grain" immediately following the words "planted to wheat,"

(*c*) Insert on line 3 of page 4 the words "for harvest as grain" immediately following the words "acreage planted to wheat," and

(*d*) Insert on line 8 of page 4 the words "for harvest as grain" immediately following the words "annual acreage planted to wheat,".

We believe that farmers who might obtain an exemption from wheat marketing quota penalties because their entire wheat production is used on the farm where produced should be entitled to participate in the acreage reserve program on exactly the same basis as those farmers who avail themselves of the 15-acre exemption We, therefore, recommend that there be added at the end of the bill a new section reading as follows:

"Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

> '(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or'."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

* * * * * * *

SEC. 334 * * *

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this Act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future national, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection.

SEC. 335. * * *

(e) If, for any marketing year, the acreage allotment for wheat for any State is twenty-five thousand acres or less, the Secretary, in order to promote efficient administration of this Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949, may designate such State as outside the commercial wheat-producing area for such marketing year [.]: *Provided, however, That any State in which for three successive years the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain exceeds 35,000 acres, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area and the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State in such three years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments: Provided further, That any State placed in the commercial wheat producing area under the foregoing proviso shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State is less than 25,000 acres for three consecutive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area if he determines that such designation would permit more efficient administration of this Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949.* No farm marketing quota or acreage allotment with respect to wheat under this title shall be applicable in such marketing year to any farm in any State so designated; and no acreage allotment in any other State shall be increased by reason of such designation. Notice of any such designation shall be published in the Federal Register.

* * * * * * *

(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: Provided, however, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat.

Soil Bank Act

Sec. 114. No person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under this title with respect to any farm for any year in which (1) the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or [(2) the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres,] *(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or* (3) the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect. For the purpose of this section, a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment or base acreage and, in the case of wheat, unless such producer knowingly exceeded the farm acreage allotment or fifteen acres, whichever is larger.

○

Union Calendar No. 294

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8456

[Report No. 813]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 15, 1957

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess

with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent year on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however,* That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the pro-

visions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this Act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future National, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsec-

tion (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (e) and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That any State in which for three successive years the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain exceeds 35,000 acres, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area and the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State in such three years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided further,* That any State placed in the commercial wheat producing area under the foregoing proviso shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State is less than 25,000 acres for three consecutive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area if he determines that such designation would permit more efficient administration of this Act and the Agricultural Act of 1949."

SEC. 4. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or".

Union Calendar No. 294

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8456

[Report No. 813]

A BILL

To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANFUSO

JULY 1, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 15, 1957

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

H. R. 8456

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 25, 1957
For actions of July 24, 1957
85th-1st No. 131

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared bills to exempt from quotas certain wheat used on farm where produced, and to provide self-help meat promotion program. Senate committee submitted report on bill to transfer certain work under Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC.

HOUSE

1. WHEAT; MEAT PROMOTION. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for consideration of H. R. 8456, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced, and H.R. 7244, to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act so as to permit deductions for a self-help meat promotion program. p. 11454

2. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "granted an open rule with 1 hour debate on H. R. 8308, relating to humane slaughter of livestock." p. D688

3. ELECTRIFICATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted 16 to 14 to not report H. R. 5, to authorize the construction of the Hells Canyon dam. p.D688

4. WATER UTILIZATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1556, to grant the consent of Congress to Mont., N. Dak., S. Dak., and Wyo. to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River. p. D688

5. FOREIGN TRADE. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported H. R. 38, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the temporary free importation of casein, and H. R. 7096, to exempt istle and Tampico fiber from the Tariff Act of 1930. p. D689

6. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7665, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 11389-96

7. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Rogers urged that Mass. be declared a disaster area in order that "Federal help can be made available to those farmers and others needing immediate assistance." p. 11453

8. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Coad discussed the effects of radioactive fallout and radiation, and inserted a newspaper article on the matter. p. 11450

9. PATENTS. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 8194, to fix the fee payable to the Patent Office, and ordered "adversely reported H.R. 2522, and similar bills, relating to patent extensions." p. D688

SENATE

10. FARM PROGRAM. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to repeal the law which permits inter-warehouse grain shipments without the cancellation of warehouse receipts in certain circumstances, subject to USDA regulations; to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and House Agriculture Committee. pp. 11328, 11453

11. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 1384, to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle (S. Rept. 703). p. 11330

12. MEATPACKING. The Judiciary Committee submitted its report on unfair practices in the meatpacking industry, to accompany S. 1356, which transfers to the FTC jurisdiction over monopolistic acts in that industry (S. Rept. 704). p. 11330

13. WILDERNESS. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Ravalli County, Mont., Fish and Wildlife Ass'n resolution favoring H. R. 500 and other bills to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. p. 11329

14. FEDERAL-STATES RELATIONS. Sen. Frear inserted a Del. House resolution supporting efforts to restore certain rights to the States. p. 11328

15. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Martin inserted an editorial, "The Treasury's Dilemma," on the problem of interest rate increases and the public debt. p. 11335

16. INFLATION. Sen. Monroney inserted an editorial and an article on inflation which contended present controls were insufficient, and discussed the farm income problem with Sen. Gore. pp. 11341-2

17. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a letter urging improvements in the Small Business Administration. pp. 11335-6

18. TAX AMORTIZATION. Sen. Morse inserted a column on tax loopholes and stated that tax laws had lead to "grand larceny within the law," under the present Administration. p. 11337

85TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 875

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 8456

JULY 24, 1957.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 363]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 363, report the same to the House with rhe recommendation that the resolution do pass.

House Calendar No. 102

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 363

[Report No. 875]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 24, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chair-

man and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 102

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 363

[Report No. 875]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 8456, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia

JULY 24, 1957

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

H. RES. 363

RESOLUTION

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 5, 1957
For actions of August 2, 1957
85th-1st, No. 138

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: (See Page 6).

SENATE

1. SMALL BUSINESS. Passed with amendment S. 2504, to extend the Small Business Administration for one year from July 31, 1957. pp. 12202-11

2. POULTRY INSPECTION. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 1747, to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 12237-40

3. TOBACCO. Sen. Cooper commended the Agriculture and Forestry Committee for postponing indefinitely consideration of S. 2569, to remove tobacco from the list of basic crops and deprive it of price support. p. 12243

4. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger inserted an item from Rep. Green's (Ore.) newsletter praising Sen. Morse for his leadership in the Hells Canyon fight. p. 12242

Sen. Kefauver inserted a table from the Chase Manhattan Bank showing an increase in the sources of energy supply in the U.S. in 1966, and showing no growth in hydro-electrification. p. 12243

5. FORESTS. Sens. Dworshak and Neuberger debated whether the Clearwater National Forest should be named the Bernard DeVoto National Forest. pp. 12191-2

6. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted its report on Federal employment and pay for June 1957. pp. 12186-90

7. PERSONNEL. Both Houses received from the Interior Department a proposed bill to authorize the training of Interior employees at public or private facilities; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. pp. 12186, 12292

8. FISCAL POLICY. Sen. Morse inserted an article, "George M. Humphrey Had a Great Fall," on the current economic situation and U.S. monetary policy. pp. 12245-7

9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson stated that the calendar would be called Mon., Aug. 5, preceded by consideration of the conference report on S. 1314, to extend Public Law 480. (pp. 12184-5, 12234). He further stated the conference report on S. 469, the Klamath Indian bill, might also be considered at that time (p. 12240).

10. RECESSED until Mon., Aug. 5. p. 12248

HOUSE

11. WHEAT. Passed with amendments H.R. 8456, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced. (pp. 12267-82)
Agreed to the following amendments:
By Rep. Grant, to strike out all of Sec. 3 of the bill, which would have provided that where a State for 3 successive years plants an acreage to wheat in excess of 35,000 acres it shall be classified as a commercial wheat State and shall remain so unless planting drops to less than 25,000 acres for 3 successive years and the Secretary determines that it would permit more efficient administration of the wheat program to remove the State from the commercial category. pp. 12280-81
By Rep. Henderson, to exempt certain county institutions, as well as State institutions, from the restriction of raising not more than 30 acres of wheat to avoid penalties. p. 12281
Substituted the language of H.R. 8456 as passed for that of a similar bill, S. 959, which was then passed. H.R. 8456 was tabled. p. 12282

12. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Hill defended the farm program against recent attacks, and cited statistics to indicate recent improvements in the farm situation. pp. 12286-87

13. THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ordered reported the following bills: p. D727
H.R. 580, with amendment, to authorize the exchange of certain land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service with Mo.;
H.R. 8490, with amendment, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the establishment of rice acreage allotments;
H.R. 8508, with amendment, to provide two county committees elected under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for certain counties in Minn. and Iowa;
H.R. 5497, with amendment, to subject recreational and fish and wildlife development projects to certain conditions in order to receive Federal assistance under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

"I get a lot of offers from big companies to take a desk with them, but I'm just stubborn enough to stick with this thing."

Now all he has to do is get the President's ear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended (1) by striking out "$455,000,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$530,000,000", and (2) by striking out "$230,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$305,000,000."

SEC. 2. Section 221 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills, H. R. 5822 and H. R. 7993.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on the Post Office and Civil Service be allowed to sit Monday afternoon during general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

WHEAT FOR ON-FARM CONSUMPTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 363 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a bill that will not arouse—at least I hope it will not arouse—as much controversy as the bill which we have just concluded.

This is an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act to correct a situation which has caused a good deal of dissatisfaction and difficulty among the smaller farmers of the country. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act as it now is, as you know, people are not permitted to raise wheat except on a quota system. There are a great many people in the country who raise a small quantity of wheat for the purpose of feeding their own livestock on their own farm and they never market any wheat at all. It is difficult for people to understand why they cannot raise any commodity they want on their own property. It is more difficult for anyone to understand why a person who is raising food for his livestock should be prevented from doing so or penalized for doing so.

A number of cases have arisen, some in my own district, where a farmer has raised wheat and cut it to put in the silo. Or, he has raised wheat to feed his cattle or his pigs, and the Government has sued him for a violation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Under the law as it now stands those cases have been won by the Government and people have been made to pay fines for raising wheat which never went off their farm.

That is the substance of the wheat-allotment provisions of this bill, and I believe that is generally agreed to. I do not think now there is any objection to it. But what it does is this: The law as it now stands permits any farmer to raise 15 acres of wheat without having an allotment. This permits him to raise 30 acres of wheat if he is not going to sell it off his own farm but is going to use it for feed purposes.

That is the substance of it except that he has to get some kind of permit from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I wish was not in the bill. I think he ought to be able to raise all the wheat he wants if he is going to use it on his own farm to feed it to livestock. But that is the substance of the bill as far as that feature is concerned.

There are two other features in the bill that affect other provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 3 amends section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may designate a State producting less than 25,000 acres of wheat as a noncommercial area. These States are free to produce all the wheat they want without respect to acreage allotments but are not eligible for any price support.

A further amendment provides that a farmer will not be ruled ineligible to participate in the soil-bank acreage by reason of his not participating in the wheat acreage.

That is the substance, as I understand it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The purpose of the bill is to provide that a farmer shall not be penalized for feeding wheat which is grown on his own farm, but this is my question: Does this raise the allotted acres up to 30 acres which any farmer can produce? Subsection (1) states:

That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however*, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions.

Is there not a provision in law now which provides for just a 15-acre allotment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I so understand that there is. I would prefer that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture answer that question.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think the law refers to the 15 acres as an allotment. It exempts a farmer who does not produce more than 15 acres. This provision would permit the farmer to grow up to 30 acres, provided he did not sell or barter or exchange any of the wheat produced on his premises, but consumed it all.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, that the wheat that is raised on that extra 15 acres is going to be fed and it will replace other feed grains such as corn, so that we will have a greater supply of corn, a surplus of corn. It appears to me that that provision would be detrimental to the corn farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Under existing law a farmer who grows up to 15 acres can either feed that wheat or sell it in a commercial market.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that.

Mr. COOLEY. Now under the provision about to be presented to us, although you would increase his allowance from 15 acres to 30 acres, you restrict the use of it to feeding on the farm. I might say there are about a dozen Members of Congress who have introduced bills similar to the bill we now have before us. There is a great deal of interest in this matter, particularly on the eastern seaboard. I can agree with my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that this will tend to increase the burdens, perhaps, of the commercial wheat producers under the marketing quota program.

Mr. JENSEN. And it is going to be a detriment to the corn farmer in spite of anything anyone says.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to have the gentleman, the head of the Committee on Agriculture, to answer the question as to whether the allotment of 30 acres for each of these farmers takes away from the wheat farmer his allotted acreage now allocated to him.

Mr. COOLEY. No; it has no effect on the acreage allotted to him. It has no effect on the allotted acreage of the wheat farmers.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And the 15-acre provision which applied in the past is still applicable?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This raises it to 30 acres.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I am most pleased that this legislation is being presented for consideration of the House. This legislation is long overdue. For the past several years I have called this matter to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and no action was taken; therefore it is timely. It will afford relief for a small farmer to permit him to grow such grain as he may need for his own use. This matter has been before the House Committee on Agriculture for a number of years and I know the small farmer will be grateful for action taken. He is now permitted up to 30 acres which will help the small farmer greatly.

One farmer in my district 2 years ago, if I recall correctly, was fined $450 because he did not comply with the regulation. This increases the small farmer's opportunity to plant up to 30 acres. It takes out the restriction of planting only 15 acres; that is, providing that it is used on his own farm for his own use. I think it is a very fine piece of legislation and I wholeheartedly support it. The committee deserves our sincere thanks for action taken.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], if I understood the question correctly, in this bill the 15-acre provision remains in the law intact except in this particular: Hereafter in counting the acreage for future history purposes, only that portion which is involved in the allotment can be counted. In other words, if a farmer plants 15 acres, having a 10-acre allotment, he can plant 15 acres as heretofore, but only 10 acres or the amount of his allotment, will be considered in determining future allotments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then the addition of 15 acres—or the 30 acres allowed here—does not affect the allotments?

Mr. ALBERT. The 30-acre provision does not affect the allotment. If a farmer takes advantage of the 30-acre provision, he cannot take advantage of the 15-acre provision of his allotment. Under the 30-acre provision, he cannot count for historical purposes any amount used for that purpose above his allotment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That was my understanding.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. So that it will be perfectly clear in my mind, would it be possible for a man who has an allotment of 300 acres to raise his acreage to 330 acres with this bill providing for 30 acres and feed it to his own livestock.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, no, 30 acres is the limit.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. After disposition of this bill today, we will go over until Monday. The remaining bill from the Committee on Agriculture will be taken up next week as I will announce the program in response to the gentleman's question.

Monday is Consent Calendar day, and there will be 14 bills under suspension.

H. R. 17, from the Ways and Means Committee, relating to the cabaret-tax reduction.

H. R. 4770, the social-security coverage, policemen and firemen.

H. R. 8216, alcohol and tobacco refund of taxes.

H. R. 8531, appointment of cadets to United States Air Force Academy.

H. R. 2816, conveyance of Esler Field, La.

S. 1482, to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act. That is to allow 2 farm benefits where in the past 1 farm only was allowed.

House Joint Resolution 370, to extend the time for the sale of war-built vessels.

H. R. 6709, relating to the Treaty Agreement with Panama.

H. R. 8795, relating to the operation of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

H. R. 6535, relating to the repair of lock and dam at Little Kanawha River, W. Va.

H. R. 5930, education benefits for totally disabled veterans.

H. R. 6908, hospitalization of veterans in the Philippines.

H. R. 8850, to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

H. R. 8772, a bill relating to military records and discharges of the Armed Forces.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar.

And a supplemental appropriation bill for 1958.

Then thereafter:

H. R. 7244, the meat-promotion bill from the Committee on Agriculture.

If rules are reported, the following bills may be brought up:

H. R. 8996, relating to the Atomic Energy Commission.

H. R. 8992, International Atomic Energy Agency.

H. R. 2462, salary increase, Federal employees.

H. R. 5836, postal readjustments and policy.

The usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] if the District of Columbia Committee has some bills that they may want to bring up for consideration some time next week.

Mr. MARTIN. We can take it for granted that the so-called gas bill will not be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not programed.

Mr. MARTIN. What does that mean?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not on the program.

Mr. MARTIN. Then it would not come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that it will not be brought up next week. All I can say is that it is not on the program.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1955, I introduced H. R. 6019; and on January 3, 1957, I introduced the same bill, H. R. 879, which is one of a number of bills of similar import introduced this year. H. R. 8456 now under debate is one of them. I am not so much interested in the passage of the bill which bears my name as I am interested in the passage of legislation which will effectuate the principle involved.

The farmers of the District which I represent are small farmers. Most of their farms are small in acreage but they are fertile, well-managed, and productive. While most of the farms are diversified and self-contained units, much of our farm income is derived from the sale of beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products.

Insofar as possible, with limited acreage, our farmers try to raise their own feed supply. What they cannot raise, they are forced to buy at a price greatly inflated by the Government subsidy on grains produced in the West.

Few, if any, of our small farmers raise enough wheat for sale on the open market, and still fewer raise enough to participate in the benefits of the price-support program. Indeed, farmers in the State of Virginia annually receive less than four-tenths of 1 percent of the wheat benefits under this program.

Ordinarily, our farmers consume their entire wheat crop on the farm in the form of food, feed, and seed. In spite of this fact, and in spite of the fact that they receive no price-support benefits, they are nevertheless subjected to acreage allotments and to the marketing penalties under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This strikes me as grossly unjust.

The Congress has the power to restrict acreage and impose marketing penalties on agricultural production only by virtue of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. The purpose of the act, as an essential corollary to the price-support program, is to regulate the production of grain which has an impact upon supply and price as affected by interstate commerce. While I realize that there are Supreme Court decisions which hold to the contrary, I have never been able to understand how the production of wheat which is consumed by the producer and never sold has any effect whatever upon or any relation to interstate commerce. How can it affect either interstate or intrastate commerce when it never enters the channels of commerce or reaches the market place?

If this legislation becomes law, as I earnestly trust it will, a little farmer who consumes all of his wheat crop as food, feed, or seed will be able to harvest as much wheat as he chooses, without regard to allotments or penalties, subject to the conditions and limitations stated in the bill. For my own part, I interpret the legislation to include not only wheat for seed and feed for livestock, but also wheat for flour for human consumption on the farm.

It is becoming more and more apparent to our little farmers that the price support program is geared to the productive capacity of the big western farmer who tills thousands of acres of flat land with highly mechanized equipment and produces tremendous volumes of grain subsidized by the Government. When our little farmers buy this grain for feed and seed, they are, by paying these high subsidized prices, actually furnishing the "support" in the price support program. Here, by the passage of this legislation, the Congress has an opportunity in some small measure to rectify this inequity and relieve the small farmer of the restrictions and penalties of the program from which he gets no benefits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

(Mr. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting H. R. 8456, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

In both the 84th and 85th Congresses, I had introduced legislation similar in nature to section 1 of the bill and had also testified before the House Agriculture Committee on both occasions. My legislation, however, would have exempted all wheat producers from marketing quotas who otherwise complied with the terms of the bill and regardless of the total wheat acreage involved. I cannot, therefore, endorse the provision of H. R. 8456 which provides that the total wheat acreage on the farm cannot exceed 30 acres, but I accept it as a step in the right direction. Likewise, I cannot endorse the provision of section 1 that no wheat producer who is hereby exempted is eligible to vote in the next wheat referendum but I accept it for the purpose of getting favorable action on the basic facts of this legislation. With these two exceptions, section 1 of the pending bill is identical with my bill, H. R. 4361.

Section 2 of this bill provides that wheat planted in excess of acreage allotments will not be counted for the purposes of marketing quotas, acreage allotments or price support levels, except where a State is reclassified from noncommercial to commercial. I think this provision will be helpful in preventing or lessening undesirable shifts in State and county wheat acreage allotments and I support its adoption. Likewise, section 3, which has no real applicability to Michigan, is evidently designed to stabilize the commercial wheat-producing area and is also worthy of support. Finally, I support section 4 which permits farmers who might obtain an exemption under section 1 by using their entire wheat production on their farms to participate in the acreage reserve program on exactly the same basis as those who use the 15-acre exemption.

Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in this type of legislation for several years. It has been supported by the administration likewise for several years. I regard this legislation as another step toward permitting farmers to operate their farms with a maximum of freedom and I think further that it will remove the dissatisfaction of many small wheat producers with the wheat program under present legislation. It will certainly benefit the many small farmers in Michigan who grow wheat almost entirely for feed purposes on their own farms. I hope that the House will adopt H. R. 8456.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I agree with that which has been said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as to the importance of this resolution, which makes in order the consideration of H. R. 8456 under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate.

The bill is designed to correct an inequity and a condition which has caused considerable concern to many of us in the Midwest especially, for a long time, where we have many small farms which are producing but a relatively small amount of feed for consumption on the farm itself, either as feedstuff or foodstuff.

I might add that a somewhat similar piece of legislation has been either approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and is now awaiting action or has been approved by the Senate itself. However, the Senate bill, as I understand, extends to all acreage planted in wheat providing it is all consumed on the farm; while this particular House bill limits the wheat acreage exempt from regulation to 30 acres, providing the wheat is consumed on the farm. But it is also provided that it can be taken off the farm only for processing purposes and then returned to the farm for consumption.

It is a very important measure, and one I believe that has been delayed too long. I hope and believe the House will approve the bill unanimously.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that at long last the Committee on Agriculture has reported favorably such a bill.

In the Great Miami Valley of Ohio the farmers are among the most law-abiding people of this great country of ours, yet in the last 3 years in my congressional district alone at least 44 people have run afoul of this law which has been gall and wormwood to so many people all these years.

Mr. Speaker, the details show that 44 good, dependable, hard-working farmers in the Fourth District of Ohio were fined or otherwise penalized, in the last 3 years, the sum of $14,486.40 for doing what they and their forefathers had been doing on their farms since they were carved from a wilderness, more than a century ago. The record by counties is as follows:

County	Farmers fined or penalized	Amount
Allen County	1	$404.54
Auglaize County	1	728.00
Darke County	21	5,163.86
Mercer County	3	3,481.00
Miami County	2	1,354.00
Shelby County	16	3,355.00

This matter was discussed at length most ably, as he discusses every matter, and many statistics were given by the senior Senator from Ohio, in the other body on yesterday. I would like to refer the Members of the House to page 12073 and the following pages of the RECORD, to get the import of that very able discussion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed that this matter is up for determination in the House. I am sure the rule will be adopted, and that the bill will be passed, and that the people will be able under the law to proceed in accordance with best American tradition.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] for a consent request.

(Mr. KNOX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the rule presented by the Committee on Rules for the consideration of H. R. 8456.

This bill is in accord with my principle on civil-rights guaranty to the American farmer under the Constitution, and that is the right to produce wheat for consumption by livestock on the farm. This legislation should have been enacted 4 or 5 years ago.

Under the laws in my State of Michigan, a farmer that would have livestock or poultry that were not properly housed or fed, would be hailed into court to answer to charges of cruelty. Farmers in my district have been ordered by the Federal courts to make restitution to the Government for the planting of wheat for livestock feed, when there was no

allocation of acreage made to their respective farms.

This legislation is highly desirable but rather late in coming before the Congress. It is my candid opinion that we have too many Congressmen who are willing and eager to farm the farmers. With less regimentation the farmers of this great Nation would have greater opportunities to govern their own farms without the interference of government.

I wholeheartedly support the legislation and hope that the rule of this bill submitted by the Committee on Rules be somewhat conformative with the provisions set forth in legislation passed by the Senate. It is urgent that this legislation be enacted into law so the farmers of the Nation may have restored to them their just constitutional rights.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefits of the House, and this is not on the subject matter immediately before us, I called the gentleman from West Virginia this morning to advise him I was going to take the floor of the House this afternoon to comment on some remarks he made on yesterday. Unfortunately, he had already left for his home in West Virginia and therefore was not available.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of this morning, on page 2, gives prominence to an article quoting the gentleman from West Viriginia [Mr. BAILEY] as saying that the President of the United States was "a lousy liar" when he disclaimed responsibility for the defeat of the school construction bill. I assume the gentleman was correctly quoted.

I do not rise to defend the President. He needs no defense from me or anyone else. I rise to express regret that a responsible Member of this body, of which I am proud to be a Member, should use such intemperate language with respect to the President of all of us. I have served here for over 20 years and during this period our Presidents have been of a different political faith than my own. During this period there have been many controversial questions arise on which there was bitter disagreement and various times I found myself taking issues with the position taken by our Presidents.

Never once, Mr. Speaker, have I, nor do I recall that any other Member of this body upon any occasion ever used such language with respect to what the President may have done, said, or not done.

Aside from that, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia does not know whereof he speaks. I happen to know that the President repeatedly urged the enactment of such school legislation. I happen to know that he endeavored to use whatever influence he possessed in its behalf. No; he did not threaten to purge from Congress those of us who did not agree. Is that was the gentleman from West Virginia believes he should have done? Mr. Speaker, we do not have that kind of a man in the White House. President Eisenhower recommended his program on several occasions and made many appeals for its adoption. To be sure, he made no attempt to dictate, not even to demand, as he respects the right of Congress to speak for the people regardless of what he, as President, may wish to be done.

The memory of the gentleman from West Virginia is indeed a short one. I, and many others on this side of the aisle, voted against this same type of legislation in July of last year; and I voted against it again this year. Does the gentleman from West Virginia believe that President Eisenhower would want to persuade us to compromise our own convictions? Is that what the gentleman wants or desires? If the gentleman from West Virginia is really interested in school-construction legislation, why does he not help the Education Committee to report the President's own bill as requested last year?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the subject mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois should come up in the absence of the gentleman from West Virginia. Evidently the gentleman from Illinois is not aware of the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia has publicly stated in very vehement terms that no such statement was made by him.

Those gentlemen who have served here for many years with the gentleman from West Virginia know that it would not be in his nature to make such a statement.

I hope that this matter may be considered concluded. I am sorry the gentleman from West Virginia is not here, I am not authorized to make any statement for him, but I do know he has publicly renounced the statement and denounced the persons who published it in the paper.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Did the gentleman hear me when I said I had inquired at the office of the gentleman from West Virginia this morning and also that I very carefully mentioned that I assumed the report as quoted was erroneous, and I quoted exactly what appeared on the ticker tape and in the paper, so that I would not be accused of trespassing upon anyone who had not made such a remark.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the purported remarks made by my colleague from West Virginia, I am quite sorry that the matter has ever come up. I sincerely hope that Mr. BAILEY's quoted remark will be proven to be unfounded. I am quite certain that down in Mr. BAILEY's heart—who has worked for things that he thought was just in this Congress—would not at least wilfully make such a remark as has been accorded to him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my question on this occasion is directed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if it is proper at this point. Has any estimate been made of the number of bushels of wheat that this bill will increase over what it would be under the present law?

Mr. COOLEY. I think our information was to the effect that it would be impossible to estimate the amount of the increase.

Mr. SPRINGER. And there is no kind of an estimate that you could give the House at all?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, this will be rather widely used in certain areas of the country, to increase it to 30 acres, will it not?

Mr. COOLEY. Probably it will. But, there has been a great demand for this legislation for many, many years. I think at least a dozen bills have been introduced by Members of the Congress, mostly from the eastern seaboard, and we have had extensive hearings. The Department of Agriculture has been complaining constantly ever since Mr. Benson has been in office about this restrictive legislation, and he refers to it even as punitive legislation. So, the committee, after considering it very carefully under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], concluded that 30 acres was a fair and reasonable limitation, together with the other limitations involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the statement made by our Republican whip, the Speaker has several times ruled that at least in the House the statement of a Member would be accepted as true. Perhaps that rule should be extended so as to cover statements made outside the House Chamber. Under that rule we should accept the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that he was misquoted. But, even if we do not accept that, we certainly ought to remember that most of us one time or another say things that we do not mean that do not express our convictions. We cannot be too critical when subject to the same fault. Forget it.

But, back to this bill which is before us and the rule. In my district two very consistent supporters, unmarried sisters, who for the past 30 years have been operating a farm, have been complaining

about this situation with reference to the use of the wheat which they grow on the farm they own. They have asked me—and it has caused considerable trouble in the office in our search for a satisfying answer—whether or not the right to grow wheat on a farm which they have owned for years and to feed it to their poultry was not a civil right. I told them that under the Constitution and the Court decisions I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it was. Then they asked me if I could not do something to protect them in the exercise of and enjoyment of that right. I said I would try and I would appeal to the Committee on Agriculture. I did. It is my hope that this bill gives the answer. Then they suggested—they are not dumb by any means—that I might ask for an amendment to the civil rights bill, they being denied enjoyment of a civil right—that is—the right to grow wheat and feed it to their stock on the farm. I should have proposed an amendment to the civil rights bill, but, of course, I was afraid it would be ruled out as not germane, so I did not suggest it then. The protection of the right to vote is important—especially as upon its exercise may depend the ability to eat.

This bill here may soften their request that the Congress enact a bill to enable them to use the land which they own in fee simple, as they wish, to use the crops which they grow on it to feed to their chickens, their hogs, and cattle.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. OSTERTAG) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 8456.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 8456, albeit with certain reservations. This bill is similar, in many respects, to a measure I have sponsored for several years in an effort to exempt our smaller wheat producers from liability where all their crop is used on the farm where it is produced. The only trouble with the measure before us today is that it does not go far enough.

As I understand it, H. R. 8456 represents a compromise which was worked out in order to provide a limited exemption for our smaller farmers, while at the same time providing protection for the regular wheat program by minimizing the effect of the exemptions.

But perhaps because it is a compromise, this bill leaves out two essential elements which are needed to make the present law more just and acceptable. In the first place, this bill limits the exemption to 30 acres. I do not feel we should have to limit this exemption to any set amount, for so long as the wheat is kept on the farm and does not enter the regular commercial channels, there will be no appreciable effect on the regular wheat program.

In the second place, I feel the great inequities of the present law make it essential that any amendment allowing exemptions should be retroactive, in order to take care of those people who have already been penalized. I believe we should provide refunds for those who have been assessed. Only by making this law retroactive to 1954 and providing refunds, as the Department of Agriculture has recommended, can we insure that justice is served for these farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture has specifically endorsed legislation which would make this exemption unlimited and make it retroactive to 1954, and that the Department has endorsed refunds. Since the Department is, after all, the administrator of the wheat-acreage program, it would seem we should ratify their recommendation in this matter.

In any case, it is certain the present law needs revision. I have received numerous well-merited complaints from farmers who have been forced to pay fines simply because they overstepped limits set by the present statute.

It seems to me contrary to all we have been brought up to believe in, when a man is stopped from raising enough wheat merely for his own use, and if he raises above a certain amount, he is subjected to a fine by the Federal Government.

While I concede there may be merit in the principle of the wheat-marketing quota, it seems to me that here the idea has been carried to a harsh extreme. Wheat used exclusively on the small farms does not enter any marketing channels. It follows, therefore, that it does not have any appreciable impact on the factors which govern the price paid for wheat to those farmers who produce it as a cash crop. As I understand the purpose of the act this bill proposes to amend, it is to protect the wheat producers who make their livelihood from such production. But I do not believe it was the original intent of Congress to make the market-quota provisions so restrictive as to tamper with the fundamental right of a man to raise enough to take care of his own needs.

As I have indicated, the general principle of enforcing compliance of these minority groups of producers with a program determined by the majority may very well be the only sound way of making the marketing quota system work. But surely, Congress should act to correct this law if it is needlessly regimenting operation of small farms which produce only for self-consumption.

It has always seemed to me that a man's right to use the product of his own property as he sees fit is a fundamental one in the American way of life. So long as he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbors or other property owners, and so long as he does not use the right in an improper manner, his rights should not be infringed.

I am sure all of us want to see as little governmental interference with the operation of individual farms as possible. We want the maximum of freedom which is possible and still make the overall programs of the Agriculture Department work.

By removing this unfair restriction on our smaller wheat producers who use the wheat for their own use, we will not only be cutting down Government interference with their operations, we will be removing a roadblock in the way of efficient and equitable management of their own farms. By letting these farmers run their own show, we will be relying on the traditional American doctrine of giving every man an opportunity to help himself.

Because H. R. 8456 is a step toward removing the present inequities from the statute books, I support it. If it were drawn to allow unlimited exemption, made retroactive to 1954, and provided for refunds, I would support it with much more enthusiasm. But at least, it deserves the support of the membership of the House.

I think this present law is all wrong when it says a man should be subject to a penalty if he raises too much wheat—even if it is solely for on-farm consumption. It is time we took this tyrannical law off the backs of our farmers, and we can take a significant step in that direction today by approving this measure.

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. OSTERTAG) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in my district the farmers are dairy and poultry farmers, and very few, if any—in fact, I would be safe in saying 98 percent of them—do not raise enough feed on their own farms to feed their stock.

In other words, they have to buy feed from the West or from wherever they can get it to the best advantage. It is the feeling of the farmers in my district that such a ruling should not be on our statutes. They consider it un-American. They do not like any part of it, and for that reason I am happy to go along with them, and express their feelings.

We do not have the kind of country where we can raise anything like the amount of wheat we need.

Now, I am not in favor of increasing that acreage or of decreasing the acreage. I think under the act that where all the wheat is fed or used for seed on the farm, and I say "on the farm" advisedly, there should be no penalties.

The 30-acre provision in the present bill before us would satisfy the farmers of my district, although in principle I would prefer no limitation at all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is out of order, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. I understand that the Philippines hospitalization bill will come up on Monday under suspension of the rules. I should like to express my great approval of that program. I am very sure that he will confirm my impression. I was at the telephone talking to the Navy Department at the time. All of us know that the Philippines are the best friends we have. They have fought our mutual foes side by side with us as they now fight the Communists side by side with us.

Mr. McCORMACK. H. R. 6908 has been programed for suspension on Monday.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point in the RECORD where the gentleman made that announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts spoke to me on several occasions this week about trying to have that bill programed under suspension of the rules, and I am very happy that we are able to do it for her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are all very grateful to the Philippines. I know the bill will go through unanimously.

A significant feature of this bill is the increased control the VA would have over admissions. At present VA determines service-connection but the Philippine Government determines medical need and actually admits. Under H. R. 6908 VA would make all determinations.

Some of those now hospitalized undoubtedly could have their medical needs met by outpatient treatment at a lesser expense if such were available. This would be provided for 5 years by H. R. 6908 for Philippine Army and guerrilla veterans.

Philippine Scouts—except those recruited under Public Law 190, 79th Congress for occupation duty—and other United States veterans with World War II service would be provided hospitalization and outpatient treatment for service-connected disabilities regardless of nature of residence or citizenship. The Scouts in this group served in regular United States Army by voluntary enlistment while the Philippines were a possession of the United States. They suffered heavy casualties on Bataan in 1942 and only about 7,500 of the 12,000 serving in 1941 survived the fighting and the Japanese occupation.

The provision of medical care for the Scouts and other United States veterans residing in the Philippines would only restore benefits available before 1946 when the Philippines became independent and provisions restricting care in foreign countries to United States citizens temporarily residing there for service-connected disabilities applied.

A further significant feature of the bill is that the Philippine Government would be permitted to use for other purposes—at their expense—those beds in the veterans' hospital not required for the service-connected disability cases. Admission of such patients would afford a wider variety of clinical material and such utilization of the presently vacated beds should improve medical care through attraction of the best medical talent.

The bill contains a limitation of $2 million a year for hospitalization of the Philippine veterans presently eligible for treatment. The cost of this part of the bill for the first year and a half would be partially offset by the present authorization of $1,750,000 for reimbursement of the Philippine Government between July 1, 1958, and December 31, 1959.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who offered a bill similar to this one, I would like to urge its prompt adoption by the House. The people who are involved in the poultry and dairy business in my district are very much in favor of it. The small farmers particularly need it. I urge its prompt passage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the author of a bill similar to H. R. 8456, I would like to express my approval of the legislation which is before us today. Although my bill differs from the committee version in that it does not limit total wheat acreage on any one private farm to 30 acres, I believe the purposes of my bill are served by this proposal.

I have received many letters from responsible farmers in my District protesting penalties for growing wheat in small quantities strictly for their own use above the present marketing quota. I recognize the need for production controls where commodities are under minimum price support programs, but it is difficult to understand why a farmer is fined for growing wheat on his own farm as feed for his own livestock. Farm experts have objected to this penalty for years, and releasing the farmer from such a penalty will bring great relief to owners of small farms who are beset with rules, regulations and restrictions.

The bill contains adequate safeguards to protect the wheat marketing quotas, including the requirements that the entire crop be retained and stored on the farm and consumed on the farm within the cropyear. There is also a stipulation against exchanging any of the crop for goods or services such as "toll-milling" operations in which the miller retains a portion of the product for his own use.

I know I speak for the many farmers in central Michigan when I urge the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at his point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of our important Third District of Ohio are law-abiding citizens who make every effort to comply to all the laws, rules, and regulations passed by the Congress governing the operations of their farms.

They have been quite irritated at times because they have felt they were being required to comply with regulations they were prevented from voting on personally. They have also felt they should be able to operate their farms without interference. Many of them resent benefits offered to them and have refused to accept them.

Two farmers in my district inadvertently erred and were fined a total of $952 for their unintentional mistakes.

It is my sincere belief, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 8456 is a step in the right direction and it is my hope that further legislation along these lines will be approved in the not too distant future.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the small farmers of West Virginia would welcome the passage of this bill. These are all small farmers, dairymen, poultry raisers, and meat growers. They rarely, if ever, produce any more corn or wheat on their own farms than enough to feed to their stock. This would be a welcome bill to them and I urge its passage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 8456, with Mr. MACK of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps never before in the history of the Republic has a Member of Congress from the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., been the author of an important farm bill. The distinguished gentleman from Brooklyn, Congressman VICTOR ANFUSO, in whose district there is not a single farm, is the author of this bill. Mr. ANFUSO, although living in the city, is a devoted friend of the farmers of America. Since becoming a member of our committee, he has been a student of the problems of agriculture. He is likewise interested in the consumers of the country. He is chairman of the Consumers Study Subcommittee and as chairman of that committee is trying to narrow the wide spread between the producers and the consumers of our country.

Extensive hearings have been held. Numerous bills have been considered. The bill before you is the finished product. The distinglished gentleman from

Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is chairman of the subcommittee. I now yield to Mr. ALBERT such time as he may desire.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and such other remarks as he might make in Committee of the Whole.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the principal purpose of House Resolution 8456 is to provide certain exemptions from marketing penalties of wheat produced for feed, food, or seed on the farm. The general exemption is 30 acres. In the case of State, religious, or charitable institutions the exemption is unlimited.

This is a matter which has been before the House for several years. There is widespread interest in this legislation particularly in the feed deficit areas of the East. A number of bills have been introduced in this and previous Congresses to exempt from marketing quota penalties all wheat produced and consumed on the farm. Such a bill, S. 959, has passed the Senate during the present session and is pending before the Committee on Agriculture.

Commercial wheat producers have with considerable justification opposed bills which would authorize unlimited production of wheat for feed, seed, and human food. Such producers have taken heavy cuts in their allotments over the years in order to try to maintain a price stabilization program. Wheat is the only basic commodity which provides any exemptions or exceptions from the marketing quota laws.

This bill is an attempt on the part of the author, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ANFUSO], and of the committee, to reach a compromise on this legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] has been interested in this matter for several years. He has spoken to me many times about the possibility of working out a compromise such as that incorporated in the pending bill. He is to be commended for the active and intelligent interest he has shown in this matter. Although he comes from a great metropolitan district, the gentleman from New York has interested himself in the subject of agriculture and has done much to bring the problems of farmers and consumers together. While the present bill is not of direct concern to his own district, it is of vital importance to his own State of New York. Much of the interest shown in this legislation has come from small farmers in upstate New York. More than that, the bill is important to our agricultural program generally and is consequently a matter of national interest. I compliment my colleague on bringing forth a measure on which nearly all of the divergent interests have been able to compromise. I am sure the farmers of his State are most appreciative of his efforts in their behalf.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] first became interested in this matter several years ago when he received a letter from a religious institution stating that its members would have to change their diet unless the law was relaxed to permit them to raise wheat for their own food. Several instances of this kind have been called to the committee's attention. Certainly no such result as this was intended when the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was enacted. The committee has taken the lid off so far as public, religious, and charitable institutions are concerned. I am sure that I express the views of the entire committee when I say that the committee hopes that this exemption will be liberally construed to include all religious and charitable organizations. It is meant also to include not only all institutions operating under the direct authority of the States, such as State hospitals, schools, orphanages, and penitentiaries, but also institutions operating under the authority of any and all of the subdivisions of State governments, such as county and municipal farms.

The bill, H. R. 8456, as reported by the committee, embraces the provisions of H. R. 6784 with committee amendments. The Department of Agriculture reported and testified favorably on H. R. 6784 and recommended amendments which have been incorporated in the pending bill.

In addition to providing exemptions to producers of wheat used on the farm, the bill seeks to provide a compensating factor for commercial growers in that it provides that no farmer who plants in excess of his allotment will be entitled to vote in the referendums or to include his excess acreage in determining future farm acreage allotments. The bill changes the 15 acre exemption to this extent but otherwise does not affect it. In setting up this exemption of 30 acres, it makes it impossible for a farmer to take advantage of both the 30 acre and the 15 acre exemption. The provisions are mutually exclusive.

Section 4 of the bill contains a provision which is necessary to make those taking advantage of the exemption eligible to participate in the Soil Bank program. Under the Soil Bank Act farmers may participate in the acreage reserve program only if they are in compliance with respect to all other acreage allotments. Under Section 4 of the bill farmers who take advantage of this exemption would be eligible to participate in acreage reserve programs on other basic crops but, of course, not on wheat.

The committee did not set the 30-acre limitation arbitrarily. This question was considered thoroughly. It was the subject of considerable testimony before the committee. It was the opinion of most of those appearing before the committee that an exemption of 30 acres would take care of the overwhelming number of cases of small farmers who have complained about the existing limitations against planting wheat for use on the farm. Most of the instances brought to the committee's attention were those of small farmers who desired to feed their wheat and to plant wheat as a part of their rotation programs. Serious objections have been raised to subjecting these farmers to penalties for planting a few acres in excess of their allotments.

The bill contains a provision designed to stabilize commercial and noncommercial areas. Under existing law, if the allotment of a State is less than 25,000 acres the State is automatically taken out of the commercial wheat area. This bill amends the law to provide that if the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in a State exceeds 35,000 acres per year for 3 years in succession the State shall remain in the commercial wheat area regardless of its allotment until the plantings in the State drop to less than 25,000 acres per year for 3 successive years. In the latter event, if the Secretary determines that it would permit more efficient administration of the wheat program, such State may again be removed from the commercial category.

The committee has held exhaustive hearings on this subject. It has heard Department of Agriculture officials and all authors of bills who desired to be heard, all grain and farm organizations desiring to be heard, and all others who appeared to testify. The bill represents a compromise of many different views. Those who oppose the idea of exemptions have insisted that if exemptions were established they should be kept to the minimum and that the wheat produced from exempt acreages should not interfere with the commercial wheat program. Those representing this point of view have insisted that both the provision limiting the exemption to 30 acres and the provision which removed the authority to include acreage in excess of allotments in determining future farm allotments should be retained in the bill. Those expressing the viewpoint of farmers in the deficit feed areas have wanted unlimited production for on-the-farm uses but have supported this bill on the theory that it is an acceptable compromise and a step in the right direction. We hope that the House will support the committee in its effort to resolve this matter in the best interest of all concerned and in the overall best interests of the wheat program and the agricultural program generally.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. I am very much in favor of this legislation but I would like to ask the gentleman a question relating to a statement in the committee report.

On page 3, at the end of the third paragraph, the report says:

> Paragraph (3) also means that the entire crop must be consumed on the farm within the crop year.

I have read the legislation carefully and I cannot find in paragraph (3), which is on page 2 of the bill, anything that requires the farmer to consume that entire crop within 1 year.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. There is no specific language to that effect. It is in the spirit of this legislation that this wheat be produced and fed as a part of the farm operation; not to be piled up year after year in storage. I think this is a matter that can be worked out on a reasonable basis by the Department.

Mr. BENTLEY. I just wanted to inform myself, if the farmer was unable for one reason or another to consume that entire crop, and thereupon would carry over a portion, he would not forfeit his exemption, would he?

Mr. ALBERT. That is not one of the limitations contained on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. BENTLEY. In other words, the language in the committee report does not have to be taken literally? It is merely an expression of hope that the wheat used for this purpose will be consumed within 1 year.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my opinion, speaking for myself, and I think it is the opinion of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman state in his previous remarks how much additional wheat production this would mean?

Mr. ALBERT. No. There is no reliable estimate of the additional wheat production under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Either as to acres or bushels?

Mr. ALBERT. We do not know how many farmers will take advantage of this exemption.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BETTS. Was there any discussion in the committee concerning the possibility of retroactive provisions, so far as this provision was concerned.

Mr. ALBERT. There was discussion of that matter, but the committee decided that if we started that, there would be no end to it. It might cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars, because we might throw open the whole question of penalties on all crops that have been paid over the years. In the interest of sound legislation, we thought we should start with the present and work toward the future.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman about section 3. As I understand it, if any State grows over 35,000 acres of wheat for 3 years, that State then becomes a commercial State.

When would the time begin to run on such determination? Will they upon the passage of this bill look at the history of the State for the last 3 years and perhaps immediately determine that that State is a commercial wheat-producing State? Will the time begin as of the date the bill is passed?

Mr. ALBERT. The time will begin as of now; in other words, Arizona having grown more than 35,000 acres per year for the past 3 years would be subject to the provisions of this bill in the next succeeding crop year.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And will become, presumably, a commercial wheat-producing State.

Now may I ask the gentleman further: On the basis of the law as it now stands how many acres would Arizona be allotted for wheat land for the next crop year?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the figures show that Arizona has an allotment of 21,401 acres for wheat for 1958. Being less than 25,000 acres, under the present law Arizona is excluded from the commercial area.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Under the present law?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. There is one statement which I think might be corrected if you read section 2. At the bottom of page 3 the report states:

"It is to be noted that the exemption authorized by this section does not change in any way the existing provisions of law with respect to the 15-acre exemption."

I think it should be pointed out, however, that under this bill the 15-acre provision is changed to the extent that no farmer can now build up an allotment by planting the 15-acre exemption as it exists under the law at the present time.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. The only acreage that can be counted under the 15-acre exemption for future allotment purposes is that portion of the 15-acres which does not exceed the farm acreage allotment. In other words, if a producer has a 10-acre allotment but plants 15 acres, only 10 acres can count in his future history, not the full 15 acres.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BREEDING. In regard to this 35,000 acres under section 3, what is the present law in regard to it?

Mr. ALBERT. The present law is this: Each year when the national allotment is fixed, the State acreage allotments are factored on a historical basis. The allotments for all the States are determined, and all of those States which come out with an allotment of less than 25,000 acres are exempt from the commercial area.

Mr. BREEDING. This one sets it up to 35,000; is not that right?

Mr. ALBERT. No, the 25,000 acres is the allotment of the State. If the State has an allotment of 25,000 acres or less it is no longer in the commercial zone. Under this amendment in this bill if 35,000 acres are planted for 3 years in a row, regardless of what the allotment is, the State comes within the commercial area.

Mr. BREEDING. What I am trying to get at is what it has been in the past. If you do not plant 35,000 acres the State is a noncommercial area.

Mr. ALBERT. Every year the allotment for every State is figured. Whenever the allotment for any State is less than 25,000 acres for the next year that State is outside the commercial zone and the farmers of that State plant all the wheat they want to plant.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. I think the gentleman is incorrect in connection with that allotment. I think the gentleman will find that if it is below 25,000 acres the Secretary may in his discretion declare it a noncommercial wheat area which in every instance so far he has done. But the mere fact that the allotment is below 25,000 acres does not exactly mean that that is not a commercial planted State.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has correctly stated the law. The fact of the matter is that the Department, I believe, has construed this law to mean that it should eliminate a State from the commercial area where its allotment is less than 25,000 acres. I think personally the Secretary should have placed some of these States in the commercial area where their wheat growers have planted 35,000 or 40,000 or even more than 100,000 acres of wheat and are selling it in commercial markets.

I think the Department should have done that, but they have treated the matter otherwise.

Mr. BELCHER. So far, however, those States that have an allotment below 25,000 acres have always been declared noncommercial areas so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. That does not bind the Secretary to declare them a noncommercial area?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is stating the law correctly, although the practice is as I have stated it previously.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. This 30-acre exemption is a substitute for the present exemption of 15 acres and 200 bushels?

Mr. ALBERT. The 30-acre exemption is entirely separate from and exclusive of the 15-acre exemption, the 2 provisions being mutually exclusive.

Mr. HOEVEN. In other words, he can either have 15 acres or the 30 acres, but not both?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has correctly stated the language and the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. If the producer chooses to take the 15 acres that can be sold in commercial channels, but if he takes the 30 acres that is restricted to use on the farm?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct. If any farmer plants more than 15 acres and more than his allotment he must either come under the 30-acre exemption or be subject to penalties. On page 2, the first subsection provides that the total wheat acreage on the farm shall not exceed 30 acres. So the maximum is 30 acres. A farmer cannot take advantage of both the 30-acre and the 15-acre exemption. There is no question about that.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. My information is that the State of West Virginia has 31,000 acres of wheat planted this year, the smallest acreage in some time. Only a small portion of that is planted on the basis of allotments, the balance being small farmers who use everything practically they raise for feed. Under those conditions, would the State of West Vir-

ginia be affected by the terms of this law at all?

Mr. ALBERT. The only way West Virginia would be affected by this is that the farmers of West Virginia who desire to take advantage of the 30-acre provision could do so. West Virginia is a commercial wheat State, and, therefore, the farmers of that State could take advantage of this exemption.

Mr. NEAL. Is West Virginia a commercial wheat State? It has a small allotment.

Mr. ALBERT. I have a list of all the noncommercial wheat States and West Virginia is not included in the list.

Mr. NEAL. It is a commercial wheat State?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I am sure he is acquainted with the penalty problem we are faced with in Ohio. In face of the Senate some weeks ago passing a Senate bill, 959, relative to the exemptions of penalties, I wonder if the gentleman would take a minute and give us a comparison of what this bill does with penalties under what the Senate bill does? Is this statement correct, that the Senate bill cancels the penalties and makes it retroactive?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. How far, may I inquire?

Mr. ALBERT. I have a copy of the Senate bill. I think it is back to 1954.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then do I understand the gentleman to say in this bill it is not retroactive to 1954 but takes into consideration the acreage and penalties from 1957 on?

Mr. ALBERT. This bill applies only to the future.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will the gentleman state whether this bill will apply to all kinds of wheat, including winter wheat?

Mr. ALBERT. This will apply to any kind of wheat. There is no limitation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Will it apply to this year's crop?

Mr. ALBERT. No. It will be effective next year. It cannot apply to the 1957 crop. It is already harvested.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I was under the impression that this bill does not apply to durum wheat.

Mr. ALBERT. Durum wheat has a special statutory status, which I do not think is material to the question of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Durum wheat gets a special allotment based on his regular allotment, so that it does not change his regular allotment in the least nor does it change the durum wheat law in any manner.

Mr. ALBERT. No. And, I will say to the gentleman if a farmer plants 30 acres under the exemption, the fact that durum wheat was planted would make no difference.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BREEDING. If a man had not been raising wheat and then decided to take advantage of this law and plant 30 acres every year for 3 years, would he be able to establish himself on a wheat-allotment basis?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's answer is found on page 3. "No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

The answer is no.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Whenever a 10-year average becomes 25,000 acres or more, that automatically becomes a commercial wheat area.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Under present law.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

(Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HARRISON of Virginia's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BROWN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been long awaited in our section of Missouri. We need it; and we do not want anything to interfere with its speedy passage.

Now what does this bill do? Well, it lets a man grow some feed on his own farm without being subjected to a despicable form of government policing that is repugnant to any independent American. It should eventually cut down on some wasteful, unprofitable administrative expense in the Department of Agriculture. It could get rid of some government inspectors flying around taking aerial photographs, checking up on farmers, and lets a man grow more of what he wants to grow as long as he uses it on his own farm. Now what could make more sense than that ?

It is one thing to control acreage on commodities that are sold for cash through regular market channels. American farmers have patiently obeyed allotments and restrictions for years in an attempt to stabilize production and prices. But when you extend those controls down to something a man grows for his own use inside the confines of his own domain, that is overdoing it. One or two steps farther and you are into a police state.

And from an economic standpoint, you are sending dollars after pennies.

Now we know what the thinking was behind this severe form of regulation in the first place. The country was producing too much wheat; and it did not sound right to cut back wheat production on commercial wheat farms and then let every Tom, Dick and Harry outside the big wheat areas grow all the wheat he could grow. Logic dictated that there should be some restrictions on everybody.

But there is a difference between reasoning something out in theory and putting it into practice. First, there was a matter of human nature. The minute the Government announced that no one could grow more than 15 acres of wheat, here is what happened in our section. Almost everybody—even people who had never planted wheat in their lives—felt they had to put in 15 acres of wheat. The Government had spoken; and the maximum acreage allowable became a sort of quota that people thought they had to live up to. That was not the way it was supposed to work out in theory; but that is the way it worked in practice. This regulation backfired psychologically.

Second, it is almost impossible to write rigid regulations that are fair and just for everybody under all situations. Wheat's common usages are for human consumption and for feed grain. But we make another use of it in our section. We use wheat for pasture and silage.

In recent years in the Ozarks, droughts have become the rule instead of the exception. So, in order to have ample spring pasture, we plant wheat and turn the stock in on it the minute it gets big enough for grazing.

We plant more acres than the 15 minimum allowable. But, of course, we never intend to sell any of the excess, and could not if we wanted to, because the Government can and does check that very carefully. But always, at the cutoff date—prescribed by Department regulation—we cut whatever wheat is left after grazing and throw it in the silo for winter roughage.

Now that has worked all right in past years; but the trouble with regulations is that there is always an exception to the rule. And with Mr. Benson as Secretary of Agriculture, it is like pulling teeth to get any slight changes in administrative procedure to cover any emergency condition.

This year, strangely enough, torrential rains came to the Ozarks. The fields were wet. Our farmers could not get in to cut the wheat by the stipulated cutoff date. The Department of Agriculture extended it 15 days or so; but in the official memorandum, they included a Government order that any excess beyond 15 acres had to be plowed under.

Now nobody can explain why Mr. Benson issued that order. Whether you cut wheat for silage on June 1 or June 15, does not make any difference. Even Mr. Benson knows that. This was not adding 1 ounce to the commercial wheat

market. This was wheat for roughage. We had been doing it every year for years. But the bureaucrats wrote a memorandum and cost our farmers a chunk of their winter roughage supply.

The more regulations you have, the more you are at the mercy of the administrators; and right through this gap, we are getting some strange administrative orders out of the Department of Agriculture. So let us fix it so they can not foul it up, at least on 30 acres of wheat grown by a farmer for use on his own farm.

Now I realize that commercial wheat farmers—and we have some good ones in our Ozarks area—may have some worries about this legislation. But I honestly believe that they have nothing to fear.

I do not believe this bill will lose them any substantial number of customers. The man who will plant a few more acres of wheat when exemptions are raised will plant it on ground that is now being planted in oats or milo or some other feed crop. Chances are, he was not going to be a customer for wheat in the open market anyway. So, I cannot see where it will do any real harm.

Remember: Even under this legislation, no one can sell any more wheat than he can sell now. You are not putting more wheat into marketing channels. This applies to wheat produced on a man's own farm for his own use.

I have said many times to many people since I got to Washington that this one bill will do more to remove the most irritating, the most despisable form of government regulating and policing that now pleagues the American farmer than any bill yet considered by the House.

No one likes to be told what he can and cannot do with something he produces himself for his own use on his own farm. No one likes to see the planes flying over taking aerial photographs to police the number of acres that a man plants in one crop. A man's farm is first and foremost a man's home. This is a step toward giving a small farmer back his home.

Let us pass this bill now. It has already been too long in coming.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks immediately following mine.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take only a moment to commend the Committee on Agriculture for taking a most constructive step in relation to on-the-farm consumption of wheat. Legislation to exempt up to 30 acres of wheat from marketing quotas when such wheat is used on the farm is vitally necessary.

This legislation will be of benefit to farmers throughout the country who carry on diversified operations. In my own State of New York, and within my district, livestock and poultry producers will be aided immeasureably. Yet, in my opinion, benefits which may result from this bill, will not in turn cause any damage to the marketing-quota programs for the great wheat producing areas of the Nation.

Adoption of this legislation will again express the belief in the American principles of freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. We are removing restrictions from the farmer who grows wheat for consumption on his own farm—restrictions actually designed for the commercial wheat producer.

A most important segment of agriculture—the family-type farmer—will be the greatest beneficiary of this legislation, and that is as it should be.

The Committee on Agriculture is deserving of praise for reporting out this most worthwhile bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, the provision of the law which we are repealing by the terms of this bill is desirable and vital to our American form of Government. The provision assessing penalties against a producer for feeding his own family and his livestock on the products of his own farm should never have been written into the law 20 years ago. I opposed it then. I therefore favor the enactment of this bill, which repeals the penalty on a farmer who produces his own wheat on the farm and feeds it to his family and to his livestock and poultry on the farm.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will not be any material opposition to this bill. The time is getting late. I have several requests for time, and in order to accommodate those who want to speak briefly on the bill I shall conclude my remarks at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the very beginning of my remarks that this is not the wheat bill that I had hoped would be presented to the House. It has been my hope that legislation could be considered which would completely eliminate an evil and unfair situation which plagues thousands of small growers of wheat today.

In a free America, in a land in which the people have flourished and prospered because of freedom from controls, we find that the group of people who have been the very backbone of this desire for freedom are those who are most completely fettered by controls today. I refer to the American farmer.

At every turn, as the farmer attempts to manage his affairs, he is subject to the scrutiny and restriction of some government program. Such restrictions are most evident when it comes to the matter of marketing. Production controls hold him in an iron mask of a planned economy for agriculture.

I am sure that the Members are aware of the extent of acreage controls that the program involves in some way or another nearly every farmer. In Ohio alone there are 158,000 acreage allotments for wheat. It is universally believed that the farmers have submitted to controls in exchange for benefits. I would like to point out the extent of benefits by way of loans which the people of southeastern Ohio received in 1956 in return for regimentation. In Guernsey County there were no wheat loans, 1 oat loan, and of the 4 corn loans, the largest was $406. In Monroe County there were no loans. In Morgan County there were no wheat or oat loans. Of the eight corn loans the largest was $3,697. In Muskingum County there were 15 wheat loans, the largest being $1,702, and 38 corn loans with the largest being $10,923. Noble County had one corn loan. Perry County had 19 wheat loans and 18 corn loans. The largest wheat loan was $2,824 and the top corn loan was $4,063. In Washington County there was 1 wheat loan and 4 corn loans. The largest corn loan was $741. In all, 109 farmers received benefits under this program which regimented thousands of farmers.

It is only when the farmer stays within the confines of his own quartersection and does not attempt to compete in the market that there is some hope that he will find himself a free agent. And yet, while he is quietly minding his own business, not attempting to raise a controlled crop for sale in the market, he finds himself held in the jaws of controls. I refer to the application of the present law regulating the raising of wheat when farmers intend to use their crop for feed and seed on their own premises. One would have thought that here, surely, this is an area in which the farmer might be left alone to make his own decisions without thought of the Government men looking over his shoulder reminding him that unless he conforms to specified Government requirements he will be subject to prosecution. But, he has discovered to his great dismay, if he dares to raise a crop of wheat for use on his own farm in excess of 15 acres, he has violated the law of the United States, even though not one grain of that wheat ever passes beyond the boundary lines of his farm. This has been the case in great numbers of cases where individual farmers who do not produce wheat for the market have no acreage authorization in excess of 15 acres.

I do not have before me national statistics which would disclose the number of farmers who have been subjected to the embarrassment and loss which has come as a result of such a program, but I have been informed that they involve many hundreds of America's small farmers. I know of instances which have occurred in my own 15th district of Ohio. A great many more have occurred in other congressional districts of my State. Only recently our senior Senator from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN BRICKER, obtained and assembled statistics from the Ohio State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee which show the following:

Two hundred and nine farmers living in 47 of Ohio's 88 counties have been fined under the existing wheat penalty section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. These fines were levied in 1954, 1955 and 1956 and totaled $59,263.97. Of that amount the Federal Government has collected $22,596.05, while $36,667.92 is pending in the form of liens. The report discloses that of the 209 farmers fined, 28 were penalized 2 of the 3 years, and 9 were penalized all 3 years.

Penalties totaling $37,393 were levied against 152 farmers in 43 counties in 1954. Penalties of $13,171.87 were levied against 57 in 27 counties in 1955, and fines of $8,699.10 were levied against 39 farmers in 17 counties in 1956. Individual amounts ranged from $61.60 to $1,451.52. Penalties were most frequent in Darke, Richland, Stark, Shelby, Columbiana, Fulton, Williams, and Brown Counties.

I will not mention the specific cases with which I am familiar lest it cause embarrassment to those who have been subjected to such indignities. Yet, I would like to mention one specific category of cases where particular hardship has resulted. In the State of Ohio there are farms, maintained and owned by the counties, where indigent, elderly citizens have come to live as public charges. Some of the residents of such farms are able to pay for a portion of their maintenance through meager private funds, old-age assistance, social security or income from retirement plans. The balance of the expense of maintaining and operating such institutions rests upon the county. As a consequence, not only is economy a necessary ingredient of such an operation, but it is absolutely essential that such farms sustain themselves by producing a maximum quantity of the food, seed, and the feed for poultry and livestock needed by the institution. With cattle and swine and poultry and flour and seed for next year's crop required, a great amount of wheat is needed to be raised on such a farm and yet, when one of the county farms in southeastern Ohio exceeded the 15-acre limitation in the raising of wheat, authorities not only considered measures against the superintendent of the institution, but presented a statement of penalty of several hundred dollars to the county commissioners and demanded payment. Not only has this law been a source of intimidation of small farmers, but it also has been directed against the indigent and the helpless and against the local governments of this Nation. Hence, I had hoped that legislation could be enacted by this Congress which would have completely wiped from the books this agricultural straitjacket.

Not only are we regimenting our own farmers but we are in the absurd position of permitting unlimited feed wheat to be imported into this country from abroad. Nearly 7 million bushels were imported last year, 8.7 million bushels the year before and 2.9 million bushels the year before that. We permit importers to do with impunity those things which will bring prison walls to American farmers.

In the 84th Congress, I introduced H. R. 4570, which would have eliminated the restriction on the production of wheat used for seed and feed on the premises of the producing farmer. A similar bill was approved by the Senate of the 84th Congress, but although several hearings were held in the House Agriculture Committee, no bill was brought to the floor. The Department of Agriculture unhesitatingly approved such legislation and the President has repeatedly called for its enactment.

In the 85th Congress, I again introduced my wheat bill, which was numbered H. R. 1144. Other Members of Congress have introduced similar bills and we were hopeful that they would receive favorable attention.

I do not wish my statements on this subject to be regarded as opposition to H. R. 8456, the bill which is presently before us. Instead, I want to emphasize that I do favor it—not the philosophy which is behind it, but because it will offer some measure of relief to the small farmers in raising wheat for seed and feed for their own use. This bill will not, however, remove the manacles of governmental control, which I feel strongly should be removed from this aspect of the present law.

This is a compromise measure. It maintains the philosophy of controls. However, it loosens the restrictions and provides greater freedom than is now possible. The bill before us provides that a farmer may raise up to 30 acres of wheat, so long as this production is used for feed or seed on his farm. It might be said that as a result of this legislation the farmer's position in this regard would be twice as good as it was before because the amount of grain which he can raise has been doubled. Nevertheless, I would like to suggest that the hands of the small farmer would still be tied in many ways as a result of this legislation.

Let us see now just what it does. First, the farmer who contemplates raising more than 15 and less than 30 acres of wheat for feed or seed upon his own premises must make an application to the county ASC committee to obtain exemption from the penalty provisions of the wheat-marketing-quota laws. This is a positive action which the producer must take. He must make application. If he does not file, he is in serious trouble and entitled to no exemption. None of the wheat which is produced under the exemption may be removed from the farm except for processing as human food or livestock feed and the entire crop of wheat produced or processed must be consumed on the farm within the crop year by the producer claiming the exemption or subsequent owner or operator of the farm. None of the wheat can be exchanged for services in processing the wheat for feed. None of the wheat may be sold under any circumstances and all that is grown must be consumed on the farm within the crop year. Any surplus cannot be stored or carried over into a new crop year. There are two restrictions right there. In the event of failure to comply with any of the regulations, the exemption certificate will become immediately null and void and the producer will then become liable for payment of marketing-quota penalties.

I want to make it crystal clear that if a farmer wants to raise more than 15 acres of wheat and obtains the exemption certificate, he must comply with all of the regulations. He is not at all in the same situation as the farmer who raises less than 15 acres of wheat and does not need to apply for an exemption certificate. In other words, under this bill it is an oversimplification to stress that acreage is merely doubled. Whereas the farmer who raises 15 acres of wheat or less need not apply for an exemption certificate and can do anything that he wants to with the wheat that he raises, the farmer who raises more than 15 acres of wheat and applies for an exemption certificate is subject to all of the regulations that I have enumerated, not on the surplus of the wheat over 15 acres, but upon the entire crop.

Mr. Chairman, I do favor the legislation which is before us because it will provide a small measure of increased freedom for the American farmer, but I do not approve the philosophy behind this practice of the restriction of acres of crops that American farmers may produce when that product is completely used upon the premises of the farmer.

I believe that Congress should give careful consideration to the elimination of all agricultural controls as soon as possible, so that the fetters of regimentation can be removed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Apparently, these farmers who were fined $59,000 marketed their wheat.

Mr. HENDERSON. The farmers I am referring to are farmers who used the wheat completely within the confines of their own property for feed or for seed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Now this bill eliminates that to the extent of the 30 acre provision.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; this eliminates that. That is correct. I will not mention any specific cases in my own district, Mr. Chairman, because it might embarrass people who have been caught in the intricacies of this regimentation, but I would like to point out there is one field of edeavor that has been restricted which we might not have thought of, and that is our county homes. The county home in my own county of Guernsey which has as its objective the caring for indigent people was brought under the regimentation of our agricultural laws because it had raised too much wheat to feed to the livestock and other animals necessary to care for the indigent people of Guernsey County.

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

[Mr. BERRY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 8456 to

exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all of the farmers wheat crop is fed or used for seed or feed on his own farm.

For some time, I have been urging exemption from liability of farmers who feed their own wheat to their own livestock and poultry. There is something obnoxious about this prohibition that has existed on the statute books for a number of years. I might say there is something un-American about it. This restriction is wrong in principle and I am happy to support this move on the part of the House to take this important step. As I understand it, this bill does not permit unlimited feeding or use of a farmer's wheat on his farm but rather permits such use where the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced a bill last year and again this year, to provide for exemptions of the use of wheat on the farm where grown without the 30-acre limitation. While I prefer such a change to the bill before us, I applaud this step and heartily concur in support of it. I hope it will pass without delay.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note the Agriculture Committee has recognized at last the inequity of penalizing a farmer for growing crops that he needs for himself and his stock.

I will support the pending bill, even though it is only a slight step in the right direction, because it will help those of my constituents who may satisfy their on-farm need of wheat with 30 acres.

For the past several years I have supported legislation to remove all penalties on wheat grown for use on the farm. Last year I offered an amendment to stop the prosecution of farmers who had been unjustly penalized. I believe with the Secretary of Agriculture that they should not be penalized if they need and grow any amount of wheat for their own use.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the entire farm program is being discredited by the controls, penalties, permits, and downright interference that is supposed to be required to carry out its purposes.

The light vote in the recent wheat referendum—only a handful voted in my district—can be interpreted as a combination of disgust, indifference, and outright opposition to the entire program. I had hoped that those opposed would vote in numbers sufficient to impress the Congress. But many of them tell me they prefer to have no part of the program. They will not participate even to the extent of voting against it.

The requirements imposed by this bill will be odious to many of these good Americans, but it may be helpful to those who can satisfy their needs for feed and seed with 30 acres of wheat.

I am glad that we are making at least this much progress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no doubt this bill will result in increased production of feed grains. In Iowa, we are more of a corn producing State than a wheat State. There is not a big production of wheat in southern Iowa, the region I have the honor to represent at the present time. Yet, I do find there are a number of small farmers who would like to have the opportunity to raise and produce enough wheat on their own farms to satisfy their needs, especially for poultry, chickens, turkeys, and such as that. I am inclined to think that the danger which some Members feel with respect to this bill is greatly exaggerated. I do not believe the increase in the production of feed grain will be as great as some Members anticipate because the man who puts 30 acres in wheat has certainly got to take that acreage out of the production of corn or some other grain unless it was already lying idle, which is not the case very much of the time in my part of the country. For that reason, I am in favor of giving this bill a trial. I have had a great deal of correspondence with farmers and small farmers who want a chance to produce enough wheat for their own needs for their livestock and poultry. I wonder if there is any estimate on either side of the aisle as to how much the increase in feed grain will result from this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. We have not been able to get an estimate except that we have had statements from various sources on this subject. It is not believed that this will increase the supply of feed grains materially because the chicken and dairy farmers who will plant wheat for feed have heretofore been planting corn or oats or other grains for feed.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what I thought, Mr. Chairman.

I believe, in conclusion, we had better encourage the small farmers and give them a chance to stay on their farms and produce what little feed grain they need for their poultry.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment the Committee on Agriculture for bringing this bill H. R. 8456 before us for consideration. Yet, I do feel that it does not go far enough to give material and necessary relief to the large segment of the farm group. Many of us in the House feel that possibly the Senate bill, S. 959, which has retroactive features is a much better bill—more equitable and really gives consideration to the one-crop farmers. It especially gives recognition to the unfair penalties that have been imposed upon farmers in various areas. Some of us feel very sincere about the argument that these penalties should not be absorbed by our farmers. I have discussed this subject at length with the leaders and those in charge of this legislation in an endeavor to get an amendment that might be considered to be germane, that would carry some of the provisions of the Senate bill and would cancel the penalties imposed and be retroactive. Our Ohio Members, Congressmen MCCULLOCH, BAUMHART, BETTS, BROWN, HENDERSON, BOW and others, however, recognize just exactly what we are up against as far as procedure is concerned, and we do not want to jeopardize this bill that is before us for consideration. It at least gives some relief and recognizes that the penalties as applied, are unfair. We sincerely hope that when the conferees go into session they will keep in mind the request of many of us from the Midwest where we have penalties established. We appreciate the intent of those handling this bill and we really hope we will get some definite relief. We certainly would like to see some retroactive features put in. So, reluctantly, we are going to vote favorably and hope that this bill will be passed and that the conferees will give serious consideration to the question of retroactive features and penalty repeals.

This is legislation long past due. We find many farmers who are charged with breaking the law. That certainly is very questionable and I am sure the courts will so hold.

Mr. Chairman, on January 3, 1957, over 7 months ago, I introduced H. R. 334, a bill to exempt certain wheat producers from liability, a copy of which I include in my remarks at this point:

H. R. 334

A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows: "(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1955 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner, or operator of the farm;

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

I also include, Mr. Chairman, a statement I made before the Agriculture Committee of the Congress on June 19, in behalf of my bill:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN J. HARRY MCGREGOR BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE RELATIVE TO H. R. 334, EXEMPTING CERTAIN PRODUCTS FROM LIABILITY UNDER THE AGRICULTURE ACT

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the opportunity of appearing before your commit-

tee, the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, relative to a bill I have introduced, H. R. 334, which is to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop if fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

First, may I say that I am not a farmer and I hope I am not onc who tries to make people believe I am an expert in this field and one who knows all the answers concerning the agriculture program. I am somewhat like one of our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, who appeared before the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, a few weeks ago relative to a flood control project. The witness asked permission of the chairman to read a prepared statement. It was granted and for about 15 minutes we listened to a very fine explanation of his particular project. Then without hesitating a moment after he had finished his prepared statement, he said, "Mr. Chairman, there is no use for you or any member of the committee to ask me any questions because this morning I do not have my hearing aid and I could not hear a word you say." I am not in that position but I do admit I cannot answer technical questions and that my views are those of a layman. I want to join with you in this committee in helping to solve a very difficult, and in my opinion, a very technical problem, namely, the agriculture problem.

Each year I make a tour of the seven counties in my district and hold meetings at the courthouses of the respective counties. I invite any and all to come in and give me their views. Last year great emphasis was placed on the subject that the farmers were not allowed to grow crops on their farm, which were essential and necessary for feed and seed. Mr. Chairman, in this great land of freedom, it seems to me that a farmer should be entitled to grow on his farm the crops which are necessary for feed and seed. As said above, I do not know of the technicalities involved but certainly the philosophy as set forth in this bill is the philosophy of all.

Mr. Chairman, in the legislation, I specifically stated that the crop isn't to be removed from such farm; that such entire crop is to be used for seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner, or operator of the farm. May I repeat, certainly the requests made in this legislation, H. R. 334, simply gives to the farmer some of the freedoms that many of us have fought for. I recognize that my recommendation as contained in the bill possibly would be an experiment; however, I am sure we all agree that the farm program that we have had for many years would come under the same category and may I say, I don't think the experiment is working out very well.

This legislation, I think, will give some relief to our rotation farmer and to those who do not come under the category of the "big one crop farmer." I honestly believe that this will be of some assistance to the farmer who finds that the price of the product he raises is going down, or at least it is not comparable with the increased costs of living or comparable with the costs of the products the farmers have to buy.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the big problems and I hope you will agree with me that this little assistance given to the farm group will bring closer together the prices the farmers receive and the prices they have to pay. I appreciate your consideration and knowing you all as I do, I am sure that this recommendation will be given every consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, many of the farmers in our district have had penalties assessed against them because they have produced more than their allotted acreage. At this point I would like to include an editorial from the Plymouth Advertiser entitled "Wheat Controls" and what is being done to one of our farmers, Mr. John Donaldson:

WHEAT CONTROLS

It is rare that the farmer presents his case against governmental regulation with the erudition that characterizes the efforts of John Donaldson.

This Huron County farmer argues well and, we think, conclusively against the principle of crop controls. He lays his arguments upon what he believes to be abrogated in administrative enforcement of the law approved by the Congress.

In doing so, he has gathered the strong support of many groups of farmers and others interested in agriculture. And important editorial support has been given by metropolitan daily newspapers.

It is clear to us, at least, that Mr. Donaldson's arguments will fall upon deaf ears. He won't get anywhere in his fight to upset the Agricultural Adjustment Act, any more than the late Henry H. Fackler did.

A long time ago, we urged Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR to use his influence to relieve Huron and Richland County farmers from the onerous provisions of the wheat and corn acreage control laws. Soft red winter wheat grown, for the most part, in this section of Ohio is not primarily a bread grain. It does not affect world markets to any serious extent. There is no reason, we think, why it shouldn't be removed from the wheat crop acreage controls.

Then Mr. Donaldson and other farmers like him could go back to farming their land, a job that's hard enough in these times. As it is, they've devolved into Philadelphia lawyers who don't stand a chance in a league that's anti-Philadelphia.

Mr. Chairman, the records will show that 209 farmers living in 47 of Ohio's 48 counties have been fined under the existing wheat penalty section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. These fines were levied in 1954, 1955, and 1956, and totaled $59,263.97. Of that amount the Federal Government has collected $22,596.05, while $36,667 is pending in the form of liens. The report discloses that of the 209 farmers fined, 28 were penalized 2 of the 3 years, and 9 were penalized all 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly is the belief of many of us that we are living in a free country. All of us should be entitled to fair and equitable treatment. These farmers who have been penalized in most of the cases, no Government benefits were accepted either directly or indirectly. In several instances the farmer has refused to have any association whatsoever with the United States Department of Agriculture to the extent of posting his lands specifically against the entry of any representative of the Department. It certainly is no wonder that the farmer, or any other person for that matter, is outraged by the penalty provision on food, seed and feed wheat used on his farm. In my mind this raises the question as to the legality of the act; on June 8, the Canadian steamship, *Sir Thomas Shaughnessy*, unloaded at Huron, Ohio, 43,778 bushels of wheat imported for livestock and poultry feed purposes. Upon checking I learned from the Grain Division of the Department of Agriculture that no law, regulation or international agreement, outside the pure food laws, restrict the importation of feed wheat.

But I repeat, the provisions contained in S. 959 should be included so that these penalties can be canceled or adjusted in a fair and equitable manner.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, on this matter of retroactive penalties, men who have worked with the wheat program for years have told me that thousands of farmers have plowed up wheat, have foregone planting wheat to keep within the law. We in the committee feel that, first of all, we would be giving those who did not comply with the law an unfair advanage; and, secondly, that we would be starting a precedent that might in the end cost the Government millions of dollars, because those who have overplanted deliberately and paid the penalties willingly, might come in for legislation or for court action for refunds.

We hope the House will support the committee on this proposal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am sure that the passage of this bill will be welcome news to all the farmers in the Eighth District as well as the whole State of Ohio. I had hoped, with others, that we might have some retroactive features in this bill. I regret the fact that there are not. I honestly believe there are many farmers in Ohio that have been unjustly charged with these penalties. I share the same hope as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that somewhere this retroactive feature may be added.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent year on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however*, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be proc-

essed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future National, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (e) and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That any State in which for three successive years the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain exceeds 35,000 acres, as determined by the Secretary, shall be deemed, beginning with the marketing year which begins in the second calendar year thereafter, to be within the commercial wheat producing area and the acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State in such three years shall be taken into consideration in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided further,* That any State placed in the commercial wheat producing area under the foregoing proviso shall remain therein except that if thereafter the annual acreage planted to wheat for harvest as grain in such State is less than 25,000 acres for three consecutive years the Secretary may, at his discretion, designate such State as being outside the commercial wheat producing area if he determines that such designation would permit more efficient administration of this act and the Agricultural Act of 1949."

SEC. 4. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or."

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANT: On page 4, beginning on line 4, strike out all of section 3 and renumber section 4 as "SEC. 3."

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment will not jeopardize the bill but will greatly improve it. It certainly will save a lot of misunderstanding. Many Members here have introduced bills to carry out the purpose of this bill, which is to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act, where all the wheat grown is used for seed or feed on the farm. Section 3 does not do that. This section is put in for other purposes, and this amendment, if adopted, will carry out the objective of the bill. My amendment affects the bill only to that extent. This has been discussed with a majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture. Personally, I see no reason in the consideration of this bill to get into any misunderstanding about allotments or any other thing. We should devote ourselves to carrying out the objectives for which the bill was introduced.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the gentleman has any information as to what States are covered. Would it include Ohio?

Mr. GRANT. I do not have that. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], does.

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman that Ohio is a commercial State. The adoption or rejection of this amendment will have nothing whatever to do with the situation in Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. How about Iowa?

Mr. ALBERT. Iowa is also a commercial wheat State.

Mr. JENSEN. And this amendment would have no effect on Iowa; is that right?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I may say to the gentleman, of course, that I am violently opposed to this spreadout of these various basic crops. We find the situation in almost every one of these crops where we curtail the operation in one State and it breaks out somewhere else. That is exactly what has happened in wheat; and in the State that the gentleman represents, Alabama, I see where they have jumped up about 120,000 acres the past year. Arizona has jumped up quite a ways. Louisiana has jumped up from 35,000 to 110,000; Mississippi from 17,000 to 164,000.

In that respect I agree with the gentleman that this portion of the bill is not completely germane to the rest of the bill. The rest of the bill attempted to correct an evil that has existed for a long time and while this also attempts to correct that evil it is not the same type of evil that was attempted to be corrected by the original bill.

Furthermore, if areas like Mississippi, Alabama, and these other States continue with this increased acreage it is only going to be a short period of time until they will become commercial States anyway. For that reason although I intended to oppose this amendment because I thought it was unfair to the commercial producing areas, I do not believe it is going to make enough difference for us to argue over and try to tie onto this bill, a very meritorious bill, and for that reason I shall not oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GRANT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, my colleague, comes from one of the great wheat-producing districts of the country. He has stated the case accurately as far as I am concerned. The wheat-producing States of this country, the commercial wheat-producing States, have given up millions of acres trying to make a stabilization program work. Their allotments have been reduced year after year until they are down now to the statutory minimum. If these great wheat-producing States had not gone along with the farm program there is no telling what the price of wheat would be. By cutting their own production they have made it possible for the noncommercial States to get a good price, or a fairly good price, for their wheat.

We thought, and the Department agreed, that if we passed this bill we could stabilize these commercial areas and keep them from being commercial States 1 year and noncommercial the next, and that we might thereby aid in the effective administration of the program.

I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma and with my colleague from Alabama that this is not material to the primary purpose of this legislation. It is not material to the basic purpose of exempting wheat producers from liability where wheat is consumed on the farm. For that reason I express my views and the views of others on the committee I believe when I say we will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. We have helped to correct one evil in that we do not permit this excess acreage to be granted on the allotment.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. It will only be a matter of time, either under this amendment or under the law as it now exists, when these States where a great increase in production is being experienced will also

be brought into the commercial area.

Mr. BELCHER. The real thing that is causing all the trouble has been the 15-acre exemption. This bill does not touch that in any respect anyway.

Mr. ALBERT. This bill does help the commercial wheat producer as far as the 15-acre exemption is concerned because hereafter instead of counting the whole 15 acres for future allotment purposes the producer may count only that portion which constitutes his allotment.

Mr. BELCHER. That is correct. This bill does help correct some of the evils.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the statement of both the gentlemen from Oklahoma and share their concern with respect to what will happen if we keep breaking down the barriers to control the production of feed or feed grains.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I join with the gentleman from Kansas as well as with the gentlemen from Oklahoma in their statements. Nobody realizes any more than I do, since I come from one of the largest wheat-producing areas in the United States, that the statements they made are pertinent to my district and I join the gentlemen and commend them for their remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize to the House, and I will not infringe on the patience of the Members at this late hour, that there are two very definite subjects treated in this bill. They are related in that they both take something away from the historic wheat producing region of the United States. You cannot interpret it in any other way as far as section 3 is concerned. The amendment pending before the House to delete section 3 I am not going to oppose largely because of the legislative situation which I am convinced exists between this House and the other body.

The hypocrisy in the situation as far as the commercial wheat areas are concerned developed in the amendments to the 1938 act at which time it was written into the amendments to section 335 that any State with less than 25,000 acres of wheat production would not come under the act and not be subject to the marketing penalties, nor would they be subject to an acreage allotment. Look what has happened. The damage is already done. That is why I am a little unhappy about it. We are going to ride along with these States that have increased their wheat acreage. All we have left are the only ones it can hurt that are not commercial wheat States, and they are these: The State of New Hampshire, 160 acres of wheat in 1956. I am not much concerned about what the State of New Hampshire is going to do. The State of Rhode Island, not a very big threat in the situation to the commercial wheat States, produced 878 acres. But moving down to the Southern States and most of the Members from the Southern States that have created the biggest offense are on the floor, we have Alabama going from 15,000 acres in 1952 to 100,000 acres in 1956. Some of these figures have already been given. Mississippi 27,000 acres in 1952, 44,000 acres in 1956. I understand it is well over 100,000 acres in 1957. Louisiana 2,000 acres in 1952, 60,000 acres in 1956. And so on down the line.

That is the thing that makes me unhappy, coming from the greatest wheat-producing State in the Union. I wonder if these States would be willing to divide their tobacco allotment? Historically our tobacco allotment in Kansas is about the same proportion as the wheat allotment was, shall we say, of South Carolina. Or would the State of Mississippi be willing to give us as much sugar allotment as they have taken away from us in wheat? Those are questions that are posed to us in the Middle West. Of course, you would not want to give that up.

But, we are asked here today to concede two things. We are asked to concede an extra 15 acres of wheat for every small farmer in the United States. I represent a lot of small farmers. The other thing we are asked to do is to ride along for another year which will allow many of these people to build up to the maximum amount so that when the boom days come about everybody will have the maximum of 25,000 acres of wheat for their respective States.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. We cannot disassociate the agricultural program from the general economy of the country, and we cannot disassociate the agricultural wheat program from the general economy of the country. There is growing opposition to the agricultural program because of these restrictions in the feed deficit areas, and we have brought this legislation out trying to help the overall agricultural picture by trying to show all sections that we are trying to solve or help solve their local problems along with our own.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he does not agree with me that it was a tragic error some 15 or 20 years ago when there was a line drawn between a commercial producing area and a nonproducing area, be it wheat or corn, or what have you.

Mr. ALBERT. That was just a few years ago; 1954, I think it was.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, it was just in recent years that the noncommercial wheat area was created. It was back in 1937 when they had a commercial and noncommercial corn program, and that went the same way. There were about 500 counties in the commercial corn program and now there are nearly 1,000 counties in the commercial program.

Mr. AVERY. I think that is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I would like to make it clear that we in the wheat producing area are not giving up anything in the first section of this bill which provides for the 30 acres, because not one-fifth of a bushel of that will compete with commercial wheat. There is not a bushel goes into the market in any way to affect the price of commercial wheat. So, if we were yielding anything in that respect, I would certainly be against this bill, but I do not see that it will hurt any commodity, corn, feed grains, or wheat, or anything else, and that is why I think the 30-acre provision in the bill is a good one. But, I do not think that your problem is so much with the commercial and noncommercial States. It is the 15-acre limitation even in the commercial States that has produced these surpluses.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Seeded wheat acres, 1952–56 for noncommercial wheat States

States	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Maine [1]	1,812	2,420	830	1,600	1,760
New Hampshire [1]	146	107	53	150	160
Vermont [1]	433	581	769	1,060	1,160
Massachusetts [1]	1,137	1,084	578	1,500	1,800
Rhode Island [1]	959	1,017	575	870	870
Connecticut [1]	1,132	950	576	2,300	2,150
Florida [1]	489	1,389	3,361	12,000	18,000
Alabama	15,000	26,000	30,000	88,000	100,000
Mississippi	27,000	66,000	45,000	32,000	44,000
Louisiana	2,242	7,948	3,856	35,000	60,000
Arizona	25,000	25,000	18,000	44,000	64,000
Nevada	20,000	19,000	14,000	9,000	14,000
Total	95,350	151,496	117,598	227,480	307,900

[1] Unofficial estimates for these States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDERSON: On page 2, line 6, after the word "State" insert "or county."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In my statement on this bill I stated specifically that it was the intention of the committee to include counties, institutions, or institutions of any of the subdivisions of State governments, and I have no objection to the amendment. I assume there is no member of the committee that has any objection to the amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this bill in support of wheat production for on-farm consumption, and feel this will be very helpful to the small farmers, in particular, in Oklahoma.

I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] for his leadership in bringing this bill before the House, and to compliment the Committee on Agriculture for reporting this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 363, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1954 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food on such farm or with respect to wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop to be placed in off-farm storage or delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone the payment of any penalty due under the provisions of this act;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producers, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions."

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm-acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat-acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm.

In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary in the case of wheat of the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crop upon which the producer obtains an exemption as herein provided, such producer shall be entitled to a refund of any penalty paid by him under the act with respect to such wheat, or of the value, as determined by the Secretary, of any such wheat delivered to the Secretary in accordance with applicable regulations in order to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, and shall be authorized to remove from storage any such wheat stored under applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty under this act for use on the farm for any purpose authorized by the exemption hereunder. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary for the payment of the refunds provided for herein, and in addition sums collected as wheat penalties which are on special deposit for refund of excess collections, may be used to make the refunds provided for herein.

If any producer on the farm votes in any referendum under section 336, beginning with the referendum applicable to the 1959 crop, no producer on the farm shall be eligible for exemption under this section with respect to the crop to which such referendum is applicable.

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat-acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent year on the following conditions:

"'(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however*, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State or county institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"'(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"'(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"'(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"'Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat.'

"SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future national, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection.'

"SEC. 3. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: '(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the House bill (H. R. 8456) was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative

13. WHEAT. Disagreed with the House amendment to S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced. Conferees were appointed. House conferees have not been appointed. p. 12648

14. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Carlson pointed to the steady decline in farm income since 1947 and urged that consumers' understand that the farmer receives only a small share of the price paid for food. He inserted an article from Capper's Farmer, "Why Not Help Agriculture, Too?--Tell Your City Friends the Truth." pp. 12574-5

15. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations for 1958 for the Departments of Commerce and HEW, District of Columbia, and including $102 million for the Small Business Administration (S. Doc. 57). p. 12560

Sen. Dworshak submitted notice of his intention to amend H.R. 8090, the 1958 public works appropriation bill, to provide for spending $500,000 for detailed plans and studies for constructing Bruces Eddy dam. p. 12565

16. INSECT CONTROL. Sen. Russell inserted the Department's report on the fire ant and screwworm eradication programs. pp. 12570-2

17. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Received from G.S.A. a proposed bill to amend section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to modify and improve the procedure for submission to the Attorney General certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether such disposals would be inconsistent with the anti-trust laws; to the Government Operations Committee. p. 12560

18. PRINTING. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the audit of GPO for the 1956 fiscal year. p. 12560

19. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Carlson inserted a resolution urging early construction of the Big Hill dam and reservoir, near Cherryville, Kans.. pp. 12560-1

20. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Neuberger discussed the effect of high interest rates on the economy of Ore., concluding that "High interest rates--the handmaiden of all administration fiscal policies--and stringent restrictions on new home downpayments have dried up a large share of the demand for Oregon lumber." pp. 12572-3

Sen. Sparkman criticized the Federal Housing Administration's increase in mortgage rates, "when 5 percent mortgages as recently as July had been selling at a price in excess of par," and inserted a table of mortgage market quotations. pp. 12646-7

21. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Johnson stated that he hoped the Niagara power bill could be taken up sometime next week. p. 12647

22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that the Senate would proceed to consider certain bills on the Calendar, including S. 1411, to require hearings before suspending employees on security charges; S. 1384, to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle; S. 377, to make final contracts between the Government and common carriers; and S. 1869, to authorize TVA to issue bonds for power construction purposes. pp. 12601-2

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. FARM INCOME. Sen. Neuberger inserted an editorial describing the economic history of a group of farms in the North Unit reclamation project of central Oreg. p. A6400

24. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Johnson inserted an editorial explaining the nature and purpose of the observance of Soil Day in Tex.. p. A6401

25. HEALTH. Sen. Murray inserted an editorial, "The Cross We Bear," which raises some pertinent questions about the increasing cost of voluntary health insurance. pp. A6402-3

26. BUDGETING. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cannon stating that "in recent weeks key officials of the executive branch have unequivocally characterized as expensive and unsound practice of partially financing Government programs and projects, which is the heart of H.R. 8002, the so-called accrued expenditure bill." p. A6405

Extension of remarks of Rep. Collier favoring H.R. 8002, and inserting comments from various newspapers on this subject. pp. A6424-5

27. FEDERAL AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Chamberlain stating that "the steady increase in Federal grant-in-aid programs is a matter of great concern to advocates of economy in Government," and inserting an article, "Federal Grants Increasing." pp. A6405-6

28. WHEAT QUOTAS. Speeches in the House of Reps. Breeding, Baumhart, and Harrison during debate in the House on H.R. 8456, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm. pp. A6417, A6433, A6433-4

29. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Patterson stating that he receives complaints from constituents regarding the extent of American foreign aid and inserting Rep. Wilson's newsletter discussing this subject. p. A6412

Rep. Smith, Wis., inserted an article, "Billions for Secrecy," stating that "in the case of foreign aid, it is secrecy--and not knowledge--that may jeopardize the national interest." p. A6418

Rep. Smith, Wis., inserted an article, "Stacks of Facts About Foreign Spending Are Carefully Kept From Taxpayer's Eye." p. A6424

30. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Beamer stating that "it is most appropriate that tribute be paid to some of the farm leaders in the agricultural State of Indiana," and inserting an editorial, "The Old Order Changeth," describing how a new pattern of farm leadership is emerging in Indiana. p. A6420

Extension of remarks of Sen. Barrett commending the Wyoming Farm Bureau for its record in membership quota, and inserting an article on this subject. pp. A6426-7

31. FOOD INSPECTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. McIntire stating that "each of us is aware that inspection of commodities is more and more being recognized as an implement for helping to cure some of the marketing problems that confront the fruit and vegetable industry," and inserting an article, "How Inspection System Works--Extent of Its Influence Spelled Out." pp. A6421-2

Mortgage market quotations

(Sale by originating mortgagee, who retains servicing.) As reported to House and Home the week ending June 14

City	FHA 5s (sec. 203) (b)						VA 4½s					
	Minimum down,[1] 30 year		Minimum down,[1] 25 year		25 year, 10 percent down		30 year, 2 percent down		25 year, 5 percent down		25 year, 10 percent down or more	
	Immediate	Future	Immediate	Future	Immediate	Future	Immediate	Future	Immediate	Future	Immediate	Future
Boston, local	[2] 101	[2] 101	[2] 101	[2] 101	[2] 101	[2] 101	[3]	[4] 97	[3]	[4] 97	[3]	[4] 97
Out of State	95–97	95–97	95–97	95–97	[3]	[3]	90½–92½	90½–92½	90½–92½	90½–92½	[3]	[3]
Chicago	[4] 98	[4] 98	98	98	98	98	[4] 92–95	[4] 92–94	92–95	92–94	92–95	92–94
Cleveland	97–98	96–97	98	98	98½	98	[3]	[3]	[4] 93	[3]	[4] 94–94½	[3]
Denver	97–98	97–97½	97–98	97–98	97–98	97–98	[4] 92½–93½	[4] 92½–93½	[4] 94	[4] 93	[4] 94–95	[3]
Detroit	97–98	97	98–99	98	98½–99	98½	93–94	93½	[4] 94–95	[4] 94	94½–95½	94¼
Houston	[5] 96½	[6] 96½	[5] 96½	[5] 96½	97–98	97–98	92–92½	92–92½	[3]	[3]	92–93	92–93
Jacksonville	97	[4] 96½	98	[4] 96½–97	98	[4] 97	92–92½	[3]	92–92½	[3]	92½–93	[3]
Newark	98–99	97–98	[2] 99	98	[2] 99	99	[4] 92–93	[4] 92	93–94	[4] 92–93	95	94
New York	98	98	98	98	98	98	93	93	93	93	93	93
Philadelphia	[6] 99	99	[6] 99	99	[6] 99	99	[4] 95	[4] 95	[4] 95	[4] 95	[4] 95	[4] 95
San Francisco	96½–97	96–96½	96½–97	96½	97	96½	[7] 91½–92	[7] 91½–92	[7] 91½–92	[7] 91½–92	[7] 91½–92	[7] 91½–92
Washington, D. C	98	97½	98	97½	98	97½	93½	[4] 93	93½	[4] 93	94	[4] 93½

[1] 7 percent down on 1st $9,000.
[2] Par.
[3] No activity.
[4] Very limited market.
[5] FNMA almost only market; FNMA ineligibles may go for 95.
[6] Trickle of 99½ money.
[7] 92 only if under $15,000.

NOTES.—Immediate covers loans for delivery up to 3 months; future covers loans for delivery in 3 to 12 months.
Quotations refer to prices in metropolitan areas; discounts may run slightly higher in surrounding small towns or rural zones.
Quotations refer to houses of typical average local quality with respect to design, location and construction.

Sources: Boston, Robert M. Morgan, vice president, Boston Five Cents Savings Bank; Chicago, Maurice A. Pollak, executive vice president, Draper & Kramer, Inc.; Cleveland, William T. Doyle, vice president, Jay F. Zook, Inc.; Denver, C. A. Bacon, vice president, Mortgage Investments Co.; Detroit, Stanley M. Earp, president, Citizens Mortgage Corp.; Houston, Donald McGregor, executive vice president, T. J. Bettes Co.; Jacksonville, John D. Yates, vice president, Stockton, Whatley, Davin & Co.; Newark, Arthur G. Pulis, Jr., president, Franklin Capital Corp.; New York, John Halperin, president, J. Halperin & Co.; Philadelphia, Robert S. Irving, executive vice president, W. A. Clarke Mortgage Co.; San Francisco, M. V. O'Hearn, vice president, Bankers Mortgage Company of California; Washington, D. C., Hector Hollister, vice president, Frederick W. Berens, Inc.; House and Home magazine, Julo 1957.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in connection with that item I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the interest rates on FHA section 203 mortgages, from the initiation of the housing program in 1934 to this date.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Date:	*FHA interest rate*
November 1934 to June 1935	5½
June 1935 to July 1939	5
July 1939 to April 1950	4½
April 1950 to May 1953	4¼
May 1953 to Dec. 3, 1956	4½
Dec. 4, 1956, to Aug. 5, 1957	5
Aug. 6, 1957	5¼

NIAGARA POWER BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could give us some indication as to when the Senate will take up for consideration the Niagara power bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not expect to take that bill up this week. I have had requests for conferences with certain Senators on that subject. I hope we shall be able to take the bill up sometime next week.

The Senator can be assured we shall not take up the bill this week. I do not know what we shall consider Friday or Saturday. I shall announce that at an early date. Tomorrow we shall consider the public works appropriation bill, and some dozen noncontroversial bills.

I believe it will be necessary to have a Saturday session. I think all of us are anxious to conclude our deliberations and adjourn sine die. I intend to do all I can to have the Senate meet early, and stay late, to clear up the calendar, and to pass measures which should be passed; and I hope it may be possible for us to adjourn sine die before the end of the month.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEE SALARY INCREASE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the majority leader when he intends to take up the House bill in regard to the basic salaries of employees of the Post Office Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator state the calendar number, and give the title of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I refer to Calendar No. 720, House Resolution 2474, to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that legislation he mentions is supported by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. They have talked to me about it frequently.

We have been engaged in discussion of the bill the Senate has just passed, and I have not had an opportunity to have a meeting of the policy committee. I will schedule a meeting in the next few days.

If some of the groups which desire to get legislation up for consideration will bear with me I will arrange a meeting of the policy committee and try to schedule as many measures on the calendar as the committee will approve.

I know of the Senator's deep interest in the postal bill. My colleague from Texas talked to me about it earlier this evening, and several Senators have discussed it with me in the past several days. I am only one member of the policy committee. There are eight other members. I have not talked to any of the eight other Members about scheduling the legislation.

We have scheduled several bills for consideration, which will consume several days' time. I would say certainly there is no likelihood of the postal pay bill being scheduled this week, and maybe not even next week.

However, I hope that action can be taken next week on bills on the calendar which we plan to schedule. I will give the Senator from South Carolina an opportunity to present his views to the policy committee. I shall give him advance notice of the meeting. If he is as persuasive as he usually is, I am sure the policy committee members will be delighted to hear him, and probably will go along with him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to associate myself with the interest which has been demonstrated by the Senator from South Carolina in connection with the bill referred to. I have talked with him personally about it, and have indicated to him, as chairman of the committee, my support for the measure. While I may not have an opportunity to appear before the policy committee, let me say that I think this proposed legislation deserves our consideration during this session of Congress. The postal workers have had nothing but trouble from the administration in their effort to obtain a legitimate and well-deserved increase.

I hope the majority leader will find it possible, with the concurrence of the policy committee, to schedule the proposed legislation so that we can vote on it at this session.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for his diligence and his effort

to bring this measure before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate what my friend from Minnesota has said. However, as he knows, the majority leader is only the agent of the policy committee. He is the servant of that committee. While he schedules the measures to be considered, he does so only with the approval of the policy committee. As soon as I can arrange a meeting, I shall consult the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have seen the Senator from Texas at work, and I know that when he says to the policy committee, "We want to take up this measure," usually it is taken up. For that reason we hope to have the bill before the Senate soon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The modesty of the Senator from Texas is exceeded only by his ability, his competence, and his leadership. I admire all those qualities—modesty, competence, and leadership. I have great faith that the bill will be brought before the Senate soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I am glad we can feel that way toward each other after 25 days of debate.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WHEAT PRODUCERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or subsequent year on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however,* That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State or county institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 335 (e) of this act, no acreage seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments and no wheat produced from such acreage shall be considered in establishing future National, State, county, and farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas and the production of wheat from such acreage shall not be considered in determining the level of price support. The planting on a farm of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, H. R. 5707, an act for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., passed the Senate on Monday last with an amendment. By mistake the House was notified that the bill had passed without amendment, and the bill in the original form was enrolled and signed by the Speaker.

The concurrent resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to submit, will correct the error and give the House an opportunity to consider and act upon the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the House of Representatives return to the Senate the engrossed bill (H. R. 5707) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., erroneously messaged to the House on August 6, 1957, as having passed the Senate on the preceding day without amendment; that upon its return to the Senate the Secretary shall transmit to the House the said bill, together with the amendment made by the Senate thereto; that the enrolled bill signed by the Speaker of the House and transmitted to the Senate on yesterday, be returned to the House, and that the action of the Speaker in signing said enrolled bill be thereupon rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CIVIL RIGHTS — EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to all the servants of the Senate, all the staff, employees, members of the press, and members of the radio and television galleries, for enduring with us during these days of great trial and tribulation.

I know that no organization in the world has a more loyal, competent, or efficient staff than has the United States Senate. Had it not been for the members of the Senate staff, our work would not have gone along nearly so smoothly. I express, from the bottom of a grateful heart, my thanks to them.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 7, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 42. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes;

S. 236. An act to amend section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended, relating to the retirement pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 294. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins;

S. 334. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain;

S. 469. An act to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, to defer sales of tribal property, and for other purposes;

S. 525. An act for the relief of Rhoda Elizabeth Graubart;

S. 591. An act for the relief of Seol Bong Ryu;

S. 650. An act for the relief of Isabella Abrahams;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Sister Clementine (Ilona Molnar);

So long as citizens of the intellect and perception of this distinguished Georgian are willing to devote their lives to the public business, the Republic will be in competent and dedicated hands. May his sterling standards serve to inspire others to a continuing solicitude for the common weal.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial of tribute which appeared in the New York Times of Monday, August 5, 1957:

WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE

A majestic decency, a civilized faith in a genteel, but steel-hard, political conservatism of a kind that is now all but gone into memory; a devotion to a true internationalism that has done no little in these past 30 years to shape the world's affairs, all these qualities are lessened now with the death of Walter Franklin George.

His last mission was as a foreign policy adviser to President Eisenhower; and in this he served with a faithfulness and a small private sense of irony, both of which his friends knew always lived in him.

But his real mark upon our public affairs, and upon the pilgrim's progress toward unity and safety of the western world, was made as George of Georgia. George of Georgia was, of course, Senator George, the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the dean and patriarch of all the Senate.

His melancholy thunders from the floor left no man unmoved; he was the greatest Senate debater of many years. He was the greatest Senator, southern style, of this century, to say the very least.

Certain aspects of what is called economic democracy were not for him; he was safe and he was proud of it, and he closed his eyes in pain at the economic heresies of the last two Democratic Presidents. These he supported magnificently beyond the water's edge; from them he turned in aristocratic horror when they dealt with matters like labor and civil rights.

But, in the last and highest sense, he served nothing less noble than honorable strength and honorable peace, warring first upon Hitler and his confederates and last upon Stalin and those who have followed him in the darkness of the Kremlin.

Well done, George of Georgia—and farewell.

TVA Repayments Into United States Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1957

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows TVA's repayments into the Treasury through fiscal year 1957 and the estimated total repayments through 1958. In addition, payments of bond redemptions and other payments include an additional $23,631,519. Total repayments through 1957—$240,131,519.

Repayments are far ahead of scheduled repayments.

The repayment table follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

SCHEDULE C-1.—*Payments to United States Treasury from power income under provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948*

Fiscal year	Minimum payments required under 1948 law		Actual and budgeted payments [1]	
	Year	Total period	Year	Total period
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000	$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	2,500,000	13,000,000	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	2,500,000	15,500,000	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	2,500,000	18,000,000	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	2,500,000	20,500,000	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	2,500,000	23,000,000	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	2,500,000	25,500,000	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	2,500,000	28,000,000	50,000,000	127,500,000
1956	2,500,000	30,500,000	59,000,000	186,500,000
1957	2,500,000	33,000,000	[2] 30,000,000	[2] 216,500,000
1958	54,059,810	87,059,810	[2] 10,000,000	[2] 226,500,000

[1] In addition to payments under the provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, bond redemptions of $8,572,500 and other payments of $15,059,019 were made prior to fiscal year 1948.
[2] Estimated.

Wheat for Feed or Seed

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1957

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8456) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, this legislation which affects my area of the country very much, is not what I had hoped for.

While I have never been against a farmer growing wheat for feed or seed, I do object to the growing of wheat in new areas, without restrictions, where it seriously jeopardizes the economic stability of the wheat-producing areas which are under acreage controls and marketing penalties.

This is the effect it has had in recent years on the section of the country which I represent. Not only have we had to cope with the rising costs of production, reduced acreage, allotments, lower supports, and extremes of weather, but we have had to suffer from the ever-increasing production of wheat from the noncommercial areas as well as increased numbers of 15-acre farms in the commercial area.

Wheat growers have increased in numbers because of the acreage restrictions on some of our basic crops such as corn, cotton, tobacco, and so forth. Without exception this new producing area of wheat can and does grow other crops better suited to their climatic conditions.

Wheat is the only agricultural crop that is grown universally in all our 48 States.

When corn acres are controlled what does the corn farmer do—he plants 15 acres of wheat. When cotton acres are cut back they plant wheat.

Some Southern States that have no wheat allotment at all will rank at near the top of the list in numbers of wheat farms in the United States today. Even farmers in the corn country who grow not over 15 acres of wheat can do so without any penalties. All the wheat grown in the noncommercial area can be grown without any acreage controls or penalties, yet both of these classes of farmers can sell their production in direct competition with the wheat producers in the commercial area.

However, my people in the commercial area, and many others who must depend on wheat as our major farm income, are restricted in acreage plantings and must pay a heavy penalty if we overseed.

It is well known that the Great Plains area is best suited for wheat production. It is the one crop that they grow best. It is the crop that has built our communities, sent our children to school, and paid our taxes.

It is the one crop that supported our Nation so abundantly in two world wars and has helped so materially since the war in feeding many of our allies all over the world.

June 6, 1957, I introduced H. R. 7952 to put every acre of wheat grown in the United States under the same controls and restrictions. I thought that this would only be fair. I was encouraged by many from the real wheat-producing area of our country. However, I ran into objections from the more diversified areas.

Today we are debating the bill, H. R. 8456, which, as I understand it, will permit anyone to grow up to 30 acres of wheat providing it is used for feed and seed on the farm.

I hope that this legislation will benefit everyone who wants to produce some feed and seed, but also give some relief to the farmer producing wheat under controls and for sale.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my beliefs with respect to this matter.

Something must be done and soon to protect this great wheat-producing area by eliminating the inequalities that now exist.

Post Office Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1957

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, the postal employees work very hard for very low pay. Whenever the opportunity has afforded itself, I have interceded in behalf of these loyal people who very rarely complain in spite of the poor treatment that they receive.

From time to time, postal employees have had to come to us for an increase in salary, and I was happy, a few days ago, to be able to vote for the bill to provide at least a part of the answer to the salary needs of these people.

Another problem they face is that of facilities. The Alabama branch of the National Postal Transport Association is located in Birmingham. Recently, the branch has been trying to secure improvement in the conditions of the Birmingham terminal. In the Alabama branch notes, printed in the Postal Transport Journal for July 1957, the notation appears that "President Newton reported on recent meeting with Mr. John Miller of the Department. Mr. Miller arriving in Birmingham armed with blueprints of the terminal with a view toward some necessary and long over-due alterations. Among other things promised was a new paint job; fluorescent lights over the pouch rack; more locker and swing rooms and, of all things, a flagpole. Exhaust fans we ask for and a flag we get. Now, to beat the heat, we'll hold retreat."

I hope that the rather modest improvements sought by these people will shortly be forthcoming. Certainly all of them are reasonable and there appears to be no sound reason for withholding reasonable things from reasonable men.

Foreign Aid—Billions for Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. This question of Government secrecy has reached a ridiculous point and it is being used as an excuse and coverup so the American people will not know what their Government is doing with their tax dollars.

The editorial follows:

BILLIONS FOR SECRECY

If you take the trouble to leaf through the Government's bulky budget book, you can find out how much money each of the armed services gets, how much goes for aircraft procurement and a good many other things.

Not so with either the military or economic parts of the Government's foreign aid program. General figures are available to the public, but precious little else. For example, the taxpayer who foots the bill can't find out how much military aid France receives, nor can he discover how much economic assistance is earmarked for various countries.

The argument for secrecy on military aid is that publication of figures, say for each country, might jeopardize security. This assumes that military aid is indispensable to security—a debatable assumption since in fact one effect of the program is to discourage allies from making sufficient efforts to defend themselves unaided; as long as we continue doing it for them, there is scant hope they will ever do it for themselves.

But even if it were granted that military aid is useful in some cases, it does not follow that revealing information about it would harm national security. It's a safe bet the Russians are a good deal more interested in funds for the United States Air Force than they are in this year's military aid figure for France. What is beyond question is that the American people have no basis for evaluating military aid in the absence of the facts.

As for economic aid, the arguments for secrecy can be charitably described as childish. One is that a recipient country might be miffed if it learned a neighboring country is getting more from Uncle Sam. Another is that a recipient country might be resentful if Congress finally voted less than the administration originally proposed for it.

The obvious answer to that kind of alibi is that if these countries feel that way about economic aid they jolly well don't have to take any. It is an insult to the American people to offer such reasons for denying them information about military and economic assistance programs into which they have been forced to pour some $60 billion since World War II.

Indeed, it is fair to suppose that the real reason for secrecy is that publication of details would raise even more questions than are already being asked about foreign aid. Some hard-working lawmakers from time to time dredge up startling instances of waste and worse; how much more of that would there be if the full story were known?

An even more important question is buried under the secrecy policy. That is the question of the actual impact of all this aid, military and economic, on the economies of the nations getting it. It is easy to talk about production gains in Europe in the wake of the Marshall plan, but how much of France's inflation, for example, is traceable to American aid?

Regarding the so-called underdeveloped countries, the question is sharper still. Here the attempt seems to some people to be a defiance of known economic laws and history; it looks like forced-draft pressure to condense the industrialization process into a few years instead of generations. For all we are permitted to know, the consequences could be the reverse of helpful.

Except in certain limited areas, secrecy in Government is always dangerous, particularly since it feeds on itself. In the case of foreign aid, it is secrecy—and not knowledge—that may jeopardize the national interest.

The Late Honorable Walter F. George

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. L. PILCHER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1957

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with, and approve of the tributes paid the late Senator Walter F. George by my colleagues. I have never known a man in my life, in any walk of life, that I thought had more integrity, courage, and ability than Walter F. George. With all of his greatness, he was one of the most humble, gracious, and kind men I have ever known. He loved people; he loved his State; he loved his Nation.

On any question, politics never entered his mind. His country came ahead of Democrats or Republicans. He shunned both society and publicity, and demagoguery just was not in his book.

Walter George was never too busy to answer his phone when one of his colleagues called, or to see them in his office and lend a helping hand with their problems.

The Nation has lost a great man, the family has lost a wonderful husband and father, and I have lost one of the truest friends I have ever had. To Miss Lucy, Heard, and members of the family, I offer my condolences and sympathy in their great loss.

Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing herewith an editorial from a smalltown country editor in Kansas, Mr. Ned Huycke. Mr. Huycke presents some facts that I believe are meritorious. They are particularly meritorious to those citizens who believe that a right-to-work law is one of the best means of approaching the evil that now exists in many of the large, boss-ridden unions—namely, to stop compulsory unionism.

Mr. Huycke most forcefully sets out the advantages in such a law. I commend his editorial.

[From the Ellsworth (Kans.) Reporter of August 1, 1957]

WHOSE BUSINESS?

Then Honorable Dave ("David") Beck, president of the Teamsters' Union, and his tender little son, have just been indicted, charged with pocketing the proceeds of the sale of a few Cadillacs which were allegedly the property of his union.

Why all the fuss? What business is this of any outsider? Wasn't it union money? Maybe Mr. Beck's membership is so fond of this lovable old gentleman and that frolicking youth, his son, that they are welcome to whatever number of Cadillacs they think they need—paid for by union dues. Why should Government butt in?

The trouble here is that Mr. Beck's membership is not free. Under the kind of deal Mr. Beck prefers to sign with an employer, if a driver becomes disgusted with Mr. Beck and stops paying union dues, instantly he loses his job.

Mr. Beck has further used the power of his union to force into union membership workers in other industries who do not want to pay union dues by shutting off all truck-delivered supplies to the business firm until its owner agrees to collect and deliver union dues from all the employees involved, whether or not they see any value in union membership.

Something like this seems to have happened in a recent Kansas City strike.

In the last election a right-to-work bill which would have prohibited involuntary union membership was defeated by the voters in Washington, Mr. Beck's home State, after a heated campaign. More recent testimony in the Washington hearing on labor racketeering hinted that half a million dollars from the dues of Mr. Beck's teamsters went into the election to defeat that law which would have allowed Mr. Beck's teamsters to resign from his union, if any so chose, and still hold their jobs.

So why all this commotion about a fistful of Cadillacs? Both the sum of money and

that section 111 (b) could have the unfortunate effect of discouraging private industry to submit proposals in the future.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8996, offers a dangerous precedent if it should emerge from the Congress in its present form.

The atomic power industry is just beginning, and by the act of 1954, Congress attempted to encourage private ownership and private participation.

I fear that a pattern is now beginning to take shape where this great new source of power will be devoted to public rather than private ownership.

Now that our last great sites for hydro power are becoming exhausted, public power advocates are turning to atomic power.

Just as the arguments of navigation and reclamation were applied to encourage Federal ownership of important hydro facilities, it now appears that the argument of research and development is being applied as a cover to encourage Federal ownership of atomic facilities. I believe that research and development should be limited to research and development, and not to construction of power reactors.

In the case of the five proposed public power reactors, there is a category of research and development, and there is a category of construction of reactors both calling for funds. In the case of privately owned reactors, there is only a category of research and development assistance, and I believe that this is the proper use of Government funds.

If Government funds are limited to strictly research and development, the taxpayer will receive more reactors, and more atomic power for his dollar, because private funds will be used in the program.

If all ownership continues to be Federal, and if private ownership is discouraged by the Congress, the great potentiality of the atomic energy power program will wither on the vine.

In order to be strong both at home and abroad, we must have a strong private industry participating energetically in the atomic power program.

I hope that my good friends and colleagues on the Joint Committee as well as elsewhere in the Congress will take a good look at the provisions which I have discussed today. I believe that a good look clearly shows that the bill is slanted in favor of public power and Federal ownership and against private ownership and industrial participation.

I hope that these features can be corrected when H. R. 8996 is scheduled to come before the House for consideration tomorrow.

Reemployment Rights of Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1957

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 8522, is to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 and the Universal Military Training and Services Act. The bill will also put National Guardsmen on the same basis as other members of the Reserve components insofar as reemployment is concerned, after participating in Reserve training.

The law now provides that persons performing training duty, such as 2-week encampments and weekly drills, have 30 days to apply for reemployment in their jobs, and it is believed that this period is unreasonably long in relation to the amount of time away from the job. The bill would remedy this situation by requiring that application for reemployment be made at the beginning of the next regular scheduled work period after expiration of the necessary travel time, or within a reasonable time thereafter.

With respect to the period in which an application for reemployment must be filed by any member of a Reserve component, the bill will permit the application to be filed after a 1-year period of hospitalization incident to training. This would eliminate the present inconsistent treatment which grants those on active duty in the Armed Forces a 1-year period of grace for hospitalization, some reservists a 6-month period, and other reservists none at all.

One of the main reasons, however, for this legislation is to cover National Guard men who take the 6-month training course. Because of a quirk in the law a member of the Army Reserve who enters the 6-month training program has his reemployment rights insured, but a National Guard man does not. This bill will place all on the same basis.

The Department of Labor recommended this legislation and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection. There will be no cost to the Government because of this bill's enactment.

Exempt Certain Wheat Producers From Liability

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1957

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Chairman, we have taken a short but at least progressive step in approving H. R. 8456—S. 959—which will exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Agricultural Adjustment Act where all their wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm.

This bill has special significance for many farmers within my own district. Like so many others, they have been severely hampered over the years by their inability to grow in excess of 15 acres of wheat without penalty, even though every bushel of wheat produced has been consumed on the premises and has never been diverted to the open market.

If nothing else, our remedial bill is likely, in the words of Secretary Benson, to "remove the dissatisfaction of many small wheat producers with the program as it must be operated under present legislation."

However, the bill we have just passed is far from ideal. It gives the farmer only a fraction more of the operating freedom he should have. Regrettably, he has been given an exemption only up to 30 acres of wheat production and even so he must apply to his county ASC committee for the exemption or become subject to penalty.

Further, he cannot turn any portion of his grain over to a miller in exchange for milling services. Every grain of wheat sent off the farm for milling or other processing must be returned for consumption on the farm.

On top of this, no surplus wheat may be stored on the farm at the end of the crop year; every bit of it must be consumed on the farm if a penalty is to be avoided.

I feel, too, that there has been a grievous omission in our failure to adopt a retroactive forgiveness clause already approved by the Senate. In the words of Senate Report 458 on S. 959:

> If exemptions were obtained on the 1954, 1955, or 1956 crops, penalties paid on such crops would be refunded; wheat stored to avoid such penalties would be released from storage; and the Secretary would pay producers the value of any wheat delivered to him to avoid such penalties.

The Department of Agriculture has been subjected to much criticism for the way it has handled wheat penalty cases, but in fairness to that agency we should not lose sight of the fact that it endorsed the principle of retroactive forgiveness at least as early as January 1956 and did so again in January of this year.

It is my personal hope—and I am sure it is shared by many of my colleagues—that retroactive wiping out of penalties will prevail in the final version of S. 959 which is to become public law.

Recognition and correction of the patent injustice which has been forced upon small wheat producers through the exactment of penalties, will go a long way toward making S. 959 a vastly more constructive piece of farm legislation.

A Ray of Hope for the Family Farmer

SPEECH
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1957

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to be given the opportunity to vote on a measure intended to give the family farmer a little relief from the stifling regulation and regimentation which presses in on him. Over a period of years, I have contended that it is unjust, unreasonable, and arrogant for a government to tell a man how much grain he may produce on his own soil, in cooperation with nature, for consumption by his family, his livestock and

his poultry on the farm, or for use as seed. Probably nothing in the rickety structure of agricultural controls has produced so much resentment among the operators of small farms as the limitation on production for use on one's own place.

This is justified resentment. The family farmer has been forced to take up the study of accountancy and law in the struggle to avoid heavy fines and the threat of jail for violations, often inadvertent, of regulations which he finds not only complex but ridiculous. The hard-working farmer who has retained his spirit of independence in continuing adversity has found that he may not even tell his Government he does not want any "help" in running his farm. His Government will help him with allotments, quotas, and restrictions anyway.

The present bill is hardly an excuse for dancing in the barnyard. It does not knock the shackles from the farmer. It merely loosens one slightly. At present, a farmer may grow up to 15 acres of wheat for home consumption without penalty. The bill will permit him to grow 30 acres of wheat for family use. Even so, some redtape remains, as the farmer will have to apply for an exemption certificate from his county ASC committee if he wants to take advantage of the change. He will have to use the wheat on his place during the crop year in which it is grown—he may not carry over any. He will not be able to trade any of this wheat for milling or other processing services.

We should pass this bill, Mr. Speaker, though it be but a tiny step in the right direction, as an expression of the determination of this House to reverse the trend of agricultural regimentation.

A Charter for World War I Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting editorial that appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, in the issue of Thursday, August 8, 1957:

A CHARTER FOR WORLD WAR I VETS

On July 24 the Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. appeared before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee to present arguments to show why this new organization should be granted a congressional charter giving them equal privileges with other recognized veteran organizations.

The organization was well represented by the present national commander, Harlan W. Barnes, of Oregon; Past National Commander Emanuel Levy, and by Merle E. Hopper, chairman of the legislative committee of the Veterans of World War I.

Hopper made the presentation and set forth in completeness the reasons why the organization should be granted a congressional charter. (The full text of his presentation appears in this issue of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes.)

We are happy to report that a favorable decision on the granting of the charter was forwarded to the full House Judiciary Committee and in the light of this action we are inclined to believe that the charter will be granted.

There is no reason why a congressional charter should not be given to the Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. We have referred to them as a new organization but as a matter of fact they have been in existence 8 years. Their beginnings were slow as is always the case with any new group trying to identify itself as something different.

Their struggles were many but, eventually, they found themselves on a solid footing and from then on the organization grew by leaps and bounds.

With little or no backing in the beginning their ranks have grown until they can now count their members in the tens of thousands, with splendid reports of new barracks forming throughout the country.

As we have pointed out previously, there is no reason why the charter should not be granted. As far as the cost to the Government is concerned, that can be discounted. It requires only a little paper work by both Houses of Congress and the signature of the President of the United States. Any cost will have to be borne by the veterans themselves in the way of setting up necessary offices to aid their comrades and their dependents in claims before the Veterans' Administration. This may sound repetitious but nevertheless it is true.

Here is a group of veterans representing a distinct class—a group of veterans which has proven that despite vicissitudes it has become a growing power, with the possibility of ever-greater development as the years pass.

Its recognition by the Congress of the United States seems inevitable. An old and striking advertisement carried the slogan "Eventually, why not now?"

There is no reason why Congress should wait longer to grant the request of the Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. for a charter. The proof of their stability is before the Congress and their recognition, alongside of other veteran organizations, is just. They plead a cause which we of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes consider worthy. Congress itself in studying their request for recognition must realize this and in all good conscience grant it.

The Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. are soon to meet at their national encampment. What a splendid tribute to the men who have battled for this recognition that they might be able to report to their national convention that the Congress of the United States has recognized their claim and has granted their simple request.

We realize that the veterans of the First World War have fallen into a class of forgotten men. It is only human nature to forget the past in considering the problems of the present.

That is understandable, but the people of our country should never forget the sacrifices these men of 1917–18 have made; and the men and women who make up the Congress of the United States are human and with a little thought will realize that granting a charter to this representative group of war veterans is but a mild token of appreciation toward them and one well worthy of the men who seek it and the Congress which has it in its power to grant it.

We realize the difficulties that lie ahead of Congress in the next few weeks in connection with important legislation, particularly before the Senate, but we do think it would be a nice gesture on the part of both Houses of Congress if they could find time to pass this piece of legislation which cannot harm the country but which can do much for the future growth of a worthy veteran organization.

A Democratic Exchange of Views About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the exchange of views over taxes, which appeared in the Argyle Messenger of August 1. It seems to me that Mr. Bouvette's analysis of the need for taxes at the present rate and under the present world conditions, is clear, succinct, and logical. I also was very much interested in his comments about those who are the greatest complainers about high taxes, "who have never had it so good":

TAX VIEWPOINTS AIRED

Editor Cliff Bouvette, of the Kittson County Enterprise, this week, furnishes the majority of the editorial comment contained in the following paragraphs.

Mr. Bouvette directed his comments to us because of an editorial we ran last week, wherein we presented favorable comment in connection with a tax reform bill introduced in the House by Representative A. N. SADLAK (Republican, of Connecticut). The bill introduced by Representative SADLAK would provide for uniform annual reductions for each bracket of income tax, over a 5-year period and would reduce both individual and corporate income taxes to a top rate of 42 percent.

Now we don't pretend to be any fiscal expert, either taxwise or otherwise, but we do believe, that any time there is presented any measure or opportunity for an orderly and/or sensible reduction of taxes, on the Federal, State, or local level, we're going to be all for it. Economy in government has got to be started someplace and what better place could it start than with a reduction of the taxes that is providing the ever higher rate of spending in every governmental unit from the local on up to the Federal level. Without so much tax moneys to spend, governing costs would have to come down. That's why when that good Democrat, HARRY F BYRD, of Virginia, preaches economy in government we listen to him with respect and would like also to see many of his proposals enacted. The same goes for Representative SADLAK's tax proposal.

We will agree with Editor Bouvette that we do not favor tax economy to the extent that it will endanger our national security program or our foreign aid commitments with our NATO or other allies. But there is much Federal spending nowadays that does not come under that heading and that could be somewhat curtailed to the benefit of John Q. Public.

Now, we invite you to read Editor Bouvette's comments in his recent letter to us:

HALLOCK, MINN., *July 25, 1957.*

ERNIE HOLMLUND,
Editor, Argyle Banner,
Argyle, Minn.

DEAR ERNIE: Enclosed is clipping taken from your last issue. It is hard for me to understand why a good Republican newspaper sees fit to find fault with the Eisenhower tax proposals.

Inasmuch as I do not like Ike's policies, I will agree with him completely that taxes are one thing no American should kick about in these days. Under the Democrats we had high income taxes, just as we have under the GOP but the facts and circumstances sur-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 9, 1957
For actions of August 8, 1957
85th-1st, No. 142

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on mutual security authorization bill. House committee reported bill to prohibit trading in onion futures. Senate passed public works appropriation bill. Sen. Carlson urged commodity approach to farm program and domestic parity plan for wheat.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Received the conference report on S. 2130, the mutual security authorization bill. The revised bill provides a total authorization of $3,367,083,000, a reduction of $250,250,000 below the Senate figure and an increase of $250,250,000 above the House authorization. It provides $175 million to be made available from funds appropriated for the mutual security program to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities, as compared with the authorization of $200 million by the Senate and $150 million by the House. It provides authorization for an appropriation of $625,000,000 for fiscal 1959 for the Development Loan Fund in addition to the authorization for a current appropriation of $500,000,000; neither authorization is subject to fiscal year limitation, and both will remain available until expended. (H. Rept. 1042) pp. 12837-38, 12882

2. WHEAT. Conferees were appointed on S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced (p. 12866). Senate conferees were appointed Aug. 7.

3. POULTRY INSPECTION. Rep. Hoeven was appointed a conferee in the place of Rep. Andresen on S. 1747, to provide for the compulsory inspection by this Department of poultry and poultry products. p. 12866

4. ONIONS FUTURES. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 876, to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges (H. Rept. 1036). p. 12882

5. INFORMATION. Rejected, 115 to 284, the conference report on H.R. 4813, to extend the life of the D.C. Auditorium Commission. pp. 12825, 12829-37

6. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Philbin urged Federal drought relief for New England, and requested that the Soil Conservation Service make available immediately new seeding for its drought-stricken farmers. p. 12875

7. INTEREST RATES; LOANS. Rep. Abernethy charged that farmers and small businessmen are being hurt by higher interest rates. pp. 12868-69

8. PERSONNEL. The proposed bill which was recently submitted to Congress by the Civil Service Commission (see Digest 134) removes the present Classification Act limitation on (1) the total number of supergrades and (2) the number of such positions in each grade. It also repeals all special authorizations for supergrades, but leaves existing jobs in their present grades subject to change by the Commission.

9. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. The Education and Labor Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 8429, to extend the time in which grants may be made to the States for vocational rehabilitation program expansion. p. D755

10. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958. In addition to the items mentioned in Digest 141, this bill (H.R. 9131) includes items for payment of various claims audited claims, and judgments. The Committee included a statement in its report as follows:

Disbursements. "In the absence of action by the Executive Branch, the Committee is using this vehicle to inform the Treasury Department that in the event a report to the contrary is not received, it will consider only estimates for the fiscal year 1959 which contemplate the dispersal of large-scale repetitive payments to the Departments and agencies concerned." (The Committee report also criticizes "interminable delay in, studying and reviewing this subject.")

SENATE

11. HOUSING. Passed with amendments H.R. 4602, to encourage veterans' residential housing construction in rural areas by raising the maximum limits on direct loans. Senate conferees were appointed. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 12753-8

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 8090, public works appropriation bill for 1958. Senate and House conferees were appointed. pp. 12710-27, 12865

13. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment S. 1411, to allow security hearings of employees not suspended from Federal employment. p. 12768

clear plant with a capacity of 40,000 kilowatts—kilowatts, incidentally, for which it has no real need. The Commission's reactor experts have stated that existing technology does not justify undertaking this particular project at this time.

It would be compelled to build this reactor, despite the fact that a group of Florida utility companies, known as the Florida nuclear power group, proposes to build a gas-cooled, natural-uranium reactor for commercial use, with a capacity of 136,000 kilowatts, and have it in operation in 1962.

The Florida reactor is being designed by Dr. Walter Zinn, one of the world's foremost authorities on nuclear reactors who has served as consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Florida reactor has been proposed under the Government's partnership program with industry, in direct response to the AEC's invitation of last January that industry join in the building of this type of power reactor.

Nevertheless, it is now proposed that the Government undertake what would be to a large extent a duplication of effort—and certainly a waste of precious manpower.

The Florida nuclear power group estimates that the cost of its plant will amount to about $350 per installed kilowatt.

Yet you are being asked now to build a plant of the same general type entirely at the expense of the taxpayer—at a cost of $1,000 per kilowatt.

This is not sound practice. It is not the prudent way to proceed with the development of nuclear power in the United States.

I am sure you will agree that it is a wasteful and roundabout way to proceed toward our national goal of abundant, safe, and economical nuclear power, and an opportunity to express that disapproval will be given you by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. COLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

SEC. 101. Authorization: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261 a. (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $259,230,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, as follows:

(a) Raw materials.—

1. Project 58–a–1, offsite access roads.

(b) Special nuclear materials.—

1. Project 58–b–1, fabrication plant, $5 million.

2. Project 58–b–2, mechanical production line, Hanford, Wash., $1,500,000.

3. Project 58–b–3, metal treatment plant, Fernald, Ohio, $850,000.

4. Project 58–b–4, improvements to production and supporting installations, Hanford, Wash., and Savannah River, S. C., $10,000,000.

5. Project 58–b–5, additions to scrap plants, various sites, $1,500,000.

6. Project 58–b–6, additions to gaseous diffusion plants, $6,600,000.

7. Project 58–b–7, reduction in fire hazards—gaseous diffusion plants, Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth, $12 million.

8. Project 58–b–8, production reactor for special nuclear materials; development, design, and engineering only, $3 million. The Commission shall proceed with sufficient design work, together with appropriate engineering and development work, necessary for the Commission to begin construction as soon as practicable after authorization by the Congress, of a large scale single or dual purpose reactor for the production of special nuclear materials. The Commission shall submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report on its design for this project, including cost estimates and schedule of construction, not later than April 1, 1958.

(c) Atomic weapons.—

1. Project 52–c–1, weapons production and development plant $10 million.

2. Project 58–c–2, weapons special component plant $6 million.

(d) Atomic weapons.—

1. Project 52–d–1, manufacturing plant expansion, Albuquerque, N. Mex, $3,325,000.

2. Project 58–d–2, storage site modifications, $2 million.

3. Project 58–d–3, high explosive development plant, Livermore, Calif., $2,100,000.

4. Project 58–d–4, engineering and laboratory building, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $1,013,000.

5. Project 52–d–5, ventilation system replacements, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $618,000.

6. Project 58–d–6, reclamation foundry, shop, and warehouse, Sandia Base, N. Mex., $308,000.

7. Project 58–d–7, reactor, area III, Sandia Base, N. Mex., $2,900,000.

8. Project 58–d–8, base construction, Nevada test site, $350,000.

9. Project 58–d–9, base construction, Eniwetok Proving Ground, $7,917,000.

(e) Reactor development.—

1. Project 58–e–1, power reactor development acceleration project, $11,500,000.

2. Project 58–e–2, Puerto Rico power reactor.

3. Project 58–e–3, fuels technology center, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $10 million.

4. Project 58–e–4, modifications and additions, aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant, area No. 1, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $8 million.

5. Project 58–e–5, test installations for classified project, $9 million.

6. Project 58–e–6, project Sherwood plant, $7,750,000.

7. Project 58–e–7, waste calcination system, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $4 million.

8. Project 58–e–8, hot cells, $3,500,000.

9. Project 52–e–9, high temperature test installation, Bettis plant, Pennsylvania, $3 million.

10. Project 58–e–10, destroyer reactor development plant, $750,000.

11. Project 58–e–11, sodium reactor experiment (SRE) modification, Santa Susana, California, $4,700,000.

12. Project 58–e–12, liquid metal fuel reactor experiment (LMFRE), $17,500,000.

13. Project 58–e–13, Argonne boiling reactor (ARBOR), National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $8,500,000.

14. Project 58–e–14, natural uranium, graphite moderated, gas cooled, power reactor prototype designed for the production of approximately 40,000 electrical kilowatts, $40 million.

15. Project 58–e–15, plutonium recycle experimental reactor designed for the production of 15,000 electrical kilowatt equivalent, $15 million.

(f) Reactor development.—

1. Project 58–f–1, waste storage tanks, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $3,700,000.

2. Project 58–f–2, hot pilot plant, $2 million.

3. Project 58–f–3, land acquisition, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $1 million.

(g) Physical research.—

1. Project 58–g–1, accelerator improvements, University of California Radiation Laboratory, California, $875,000.

(h) Physical research.—

1. Project 58–h–1, reactor improvements, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $380,000.

(i) Biology and medicine.—

1. Project 58–i–1, mammalian radiation injury and recovery area, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, $475,000.

(j) Training, education, and information.—

1. Project 58–j–1, nuclear training project, Regional Nuclear Training Center, Puerto Rico, $2,500,000.

(k) Community.—

1. Project 58–k–1, schools, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $965,000.

2. Project 58–k–2, housing modifications, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $1 million.

3. Project 58–k–3, additional water well, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $138,000.

(l) General plant projects: $26,016,000.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8996) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8090) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. TABER, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. BUDGE.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

TO AMEND AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 959), to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, be removed as a conferee on the bill S. 1747 and that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] be appointed in his stead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change of conferees.

FOR YOUTH FITNESS

(Mr. HUDDLESTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it appears that children's play habits, like everything else, have changed in recent years. Healthful recreational games like hopscotch and blindman's buff have given way to such dubious indoor diversions as Man From Mars and Superman. What has happened, it seems is that pastimes of mere amusement have completely replaced the wholesome muscle-building variety of games. Undoubtedly, the advent of television has drawn the children indoors from the health-giving exercises of the playground.

This is one of the worst problems brought about by the progressive urbanization of American living conditions. The victims are our children, although they now fail to realize the ill effects. They suffer physically because they lack the exercise which outdoor play affords. Children are encouraged to play in the parlor when they should be working out in the gymnasium. The immediate result is that this generation of children is growing flabby, falling far below normal standards in physical fitness. They are becoming, in effect, softies. Exercise builds stout bodies and insures bountiful health. Without proper exercise, youth can suffer now as well as later.

There is a common belief that children, if given the opportunity to play, will adequately exercise themselves. The changing times in which we live is turning this concept into fallacy. Our conveniences of life are by eliminating the need for ordinary physical activity contributing to a physical and moral softening of young generations. Within the last few years, there has been a change in the attitude of many children regarding their play habits. As youngsters, we used to play and play hard because we had rather play than do anything else. With automation and pushbutton gadgets, there is greater need for exercise today. However, there are so many constant attractions nowadays that some children actually do not want to play. They had rather watch television or go to the movies.

Without an outlet for his excess energies, the youth may seek daring and out of the ordinary escapes. Instead of wholesome play, he may turn to gang warfare, crimes of violence, or other delinquent activities. It is far easier to provide for proper recreation than it is to cope with juvenile delinquents. Yet, delinquency is increasing in incidence every year. It is considered a symptom of many deep-seated causes, a principal one of which is a lack of recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we awaken to the fact that more attention must be given to our children's physical education. Unless we achieve youth fitness today, we cannot have national fitness in the years to come. Already, the President has designated a group of outstanding citizens to study this alarming situation. The President's Council on Youth Fitness has expressed concern over the ill effects of soft-living habits on this generation of children. The Council, together with a Citizens Advisory Committee, is out to find effective methods to achieve physical fitness in today's youth.

Pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor is a bill which I have introduced to boost fitness and to thwart delinquency. My bill, H. R. 7875, would establish the Civic Health through Athletic and Mental Proficiency Society, the initial letters of which spell CHAMPS. This legislation would reward youngsters who are champs in their fields, either culturally or physically. Specifically, the bill provides for a series of local, district, State and national awards upon the attainment of certain standards.

By encouraging wholesome leisure time activities through cultural pursuits and physical achievements, this program would contribute significantly to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. The program would direct the excess energy of youth into sound channels conducive to absorbing excess time and energy while, at the same time, stimulating the minds and bodies of the younger generation toward more intensive physical prowess and cultural progress. Physical fitness, it is pointed out, complements moral and mental fitness.

While this legislation will by no means eliminate juvenile delinquency, it attacks the problem from a positive angle. By offering an appealing program for participation, it will undoubtedly provide an effective delinquency countermeasure. It stands to reason that boys and girls' participation in this program, whether in the cultural or physical fields or both, will be a deterrent against delinquency. What is more, it is safe to assume that these children in turn will oppose any delinquency on the part of their young friends.

One of the most significant features of this legislation is the provision that each participant achieving certain goals be rewarded. This form of honor, I strongly believe, is far more desirable than that of direct competition against each other. This is the type of system the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts employ in awarding their much-sought merit badges.

Mass participation is to be desired without undue emphasis on those who are physically or intellectually gifted. For this reason, a program designed to reach the boy or girl with ordinary physical and cultural abilities must not overly concentrate on competition. In our time, there is entirely too much stress placed on winning the game, rather than in the sport of playing the game. In emphasizing character-building activities, this program cannot further magnify the victor and accentuate in youth the sole desire to win no matter how the game is played. The principal objective of this program, therefore, is to build strong bodies and sound minds and not to create a generation of literary geniuses or super-athletes.

Competitive sports still have an important place in our physical education system. Team activities teach sportsmanship and spread the glory of winning over the entire team, rather than heap all the praise on one individual. Too much importance is placed on team sports, however, and not enough on the healthful solo exercises of the gymnasium. It is significant that cadets at the United States Military Academy, whose physical fitness is a virtual necessity, are all required to box. The benefit comes in the participation.

The legislation which I have introduced provides for a fairly flexible youth program. It is national in scope to afford uniformity in achievement standards and goals. However, there is no Federal control, as the program's administration is purely local. In drafting this bill, it was my intention to restrict the activities of the Federal Government as much as possible, yet allowing for nationwide participation. For this reason, the bill provides for the appointment of a State chairman and a chairman for each congressional district, who would have

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 16, 1957
For actions of August 15, 1957
85th-1st, No. 148

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed mutual security appropriation bill. Conferees agreed to file report on bill to exempt from quotas wheat used on farm where produced. Senate confirmed Paarlberg nomination. Senate committee reported supplemental appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS. By a vote of 252 to 130, passed with amendments H.R. 9302, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1958. (pp. 13497, 13499-538). The bill was reported without amendment by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1172). (p. 13544) As reported and passed the bill includes $300 million for advances to the development loan fund, $113 for technical cooperation, and $15,500,000 for the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance of which amount the U.S. contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percent of the U.N. program.

2. WHEAT. The conferees agreed to file a conference report on S. ~~1959~~ 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced. p. D786

3. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 1740, to authorize the payment from the Employees' Life Insurance Fund of expenses incurred by the CSC in assuming and maintaining the assets and liabilities of certain beneficial associations (H. Rept. 1174). p. 13544

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in either suspending or retaining on duty a Federal employee prior to security hearings. p. D786

Rep. Philbin urged the passage of pay raise legislation before adjournment of Congress. p. 13538

4. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H.R. 6959, to authorize the use of CCC surplus commodities to augment the food supplies for migratory waterfowl (H. Rept. 1178). p. 13544

5. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Thompson, N.J., spoke of the need for drought relief in N.J., and inserted correspondence, including his letter to the President, on the matter. pp. 13538-39

6. EGG PRICES. Rep. Knutson urged an increase in the price of eggs to the farmer. p. 13539

7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the conference report on S. 1747, the poultry inspection bill will be considered today, Aug. 16. p. 13538

SENATE

8. NOMINATIONS. By a vote of 42 to 32, confirmed the nomination of Don Paarlberg to be Assistanct Secretary of Agriculture and member of the CCC Board. The debate included a general discussion of farm policy and programs. pp. 13617-41

Confirmed the nomination of Jerome K. Kuykendall to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, 50 to 25, after general debate on power policies. pp. 13554-9, 13575-93, 13595-615

9. WATER RESOURCES. Disagreed with the House amendment to S. 1482, to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act so as to increase the limitation on the acreage which one family might have of irrigated land. Senate Conferees were appointed. p. 13569

10. RECORDS; ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Sen. O'Mahoney submitted a star print of a revised report from the Judiciary Committee on S. 2377, to amend the procedures regarding demands for reports and statements of witnesses, and Sen. McNamara stated his opposition to the bill and inserted an editorial contending the bill was unnecessary and hastily drawn up. pp. 13593-4

Without objection the Judiciary Committee then withdrew its previous report (S. Rept. 569) on S. 2377.

11. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee submitted a report on Timber Sales, Quinaielt Indian Reservation, Wash., to be printed after Aug. 24 with a minority report by Sen. Watkins (S. Rept. 971). p. 13549

12. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N.J., urged the passage of the full amount authorized for the mutual security bill, and inserted the President's press release opposing some cuts and urging their restoration by the Senate. p. 13552

13. ROADS. Sen. Neuberger inserted two editorials urging haste in disposing of the highway signboard bills held in Committee (pp. 13552-3), and later stated the Public Works Committee would meet Aug. 20 to consider the bills (p. 13595).

14. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Mansfield inserted an editorial on the "machinery" of the "Greatest Air Conditioning System in the World," the mountains, streams, and forests which treat air currents to give Mont. a cool climate. p. 13553

15. POSTAL RATES. Sen. Johnston announced the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would study H.R. 5836, to increase postal rates, very carefully before passing judgement on it. p. 13595

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 19, 1957
For actions of August 16, 1957
85th-1st, No. 149

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on bill to exempt from quotas wheat used on farm where produced. House agreed to conference report on poultry inspection bill. Sen. Humphrey urged creation of food stockpiles overseas.

SENATE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958. This bill, H.R. 9131, was made the unfinished business. p. 13726

Sen. Hayden submitted a notice of a motion to suspend the rule to propose amendments to H.R. 9131, the 1958 supplemental appropriation bill. These amendments include committee amendments to provide $25 million for ACPS for emergency conservation measures and another to include language to authorize the use of not to exceed $50,000 of the funds appropriated for forest land management in 1958 for the acquisition of sites for buildings outside the national forests.

The bill also includes $175,000 to complete the work of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control by Dec. 31, 1957, $13,317,000 for TVA, and various amounts for claims.

The committee report includes the following statement: "The committee believes that the regular agricultural conservation program for 1958 should not be restricted by setting up a 10 percent reserve in all the States, or be redirected to meet disaster needs without the prior approval of Congress. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Agriculture develop an overall plan and program in connection with emergency conservation measures, and present them for consideration by the committee at the next session of the Congress."

The committee report also describes and commends the real property inventory being maintained by GSA.

2. WOOL IMPORTS. The Daily Digest states that the Finance Committee ordered reported "H.R. 6894, amending the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings (amendments would (1) permit duty-free entry of wool yarns dyed and cut in uniform length not exceeding 3 inches, and (2) impose a 3-cents-per-pound import duty on lead and zinc)." p. D790

3. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Humphrey urged creation of food stockpiles in foreign nations to insure adequate food supplies in case of war, through the Public Law 480 program or outright grants. He inserted Defense Department answers to questions involving defense food reserves. pp. 13666-9

4. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N.J., criticized the "thoughtless cut" in the foreign aid program budget, and inserted an editorial, "Investment in Freedom." pp. 13651-2

5. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Talmadge inserted an article asserting that "The Eisenhower administration produced a crop program in agriculture that has just ruined the Negro farmer in the South," in commenting on the Civil Rights legislation. pp. 13649-50

6. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Sen. Williams inserted a GSA report showing the net proceeds from the sale of surplus property, 1945 to 1956, totalling $3.2 billion. p. 13659

7. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Sens. Javits, Douglas, Bush, Case (N.J.), Cooper, and Humphrey, discussed the Civil Rights bill and its effects on other statutes involving criminal contempt suits in equity, by requiring jury trials and limiting the fines for violations of such injunctions. pp. 13659-66

8. ATOMIC ENERGY. Passed with amendment H.R. 8996, authorizing appropriations for the AEC to acquire or construct power reactor facilities. Rejected, 34 to 42, an amendment by Sen. Hickenlooper to delete language concerning the waiver of use charges by AEC for cooperatives only. S. 2674 was indefinitely postponed. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 13659, 13669-96, 13698-724

Passed with amendment H.R. 7383, to provide Governmental indemnity and limitations on private liability for atomic energy hazards of certain licensees. S. 2051 was indefinitely postponed. pp. 13724-6

9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that on Mon., Aug. 19, the Senate would consider the supplemental appropriation bill, followed by a series of bills including S. 25, to make the effective date of wage-board personnel pay increases retroactive to 30 days after start of surveys; H.R. 2237, to transfer certain VA public lands to the Johnson City (Tenn.) National Farm Loan Association and the East Tenn. Production Credit Ass'n; and S. 2757, to authorize construction of a dam on Burns Creek, Ida.. pp. 13655, 13726

10. ADJOURNED to Mon., Aug. 19. p. 13726

HOUSE

11. WHEAT. Received the conference report on S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced (H. Rept. 1180). (pp. 13745-46) Following is the statement of the managers on the part of the House regarding the bill as agreed to in conference:

"The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H.R. 8456 as passed by the House on August 2, 1957. The bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment which has been agreed upon by the conferees. It differs in only two substantial respects from the House amendment."

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT ON EXCESS ACREAGE

"The House amendment provided that no wheat produced from any acreage in excess of acreage allotments should be considered in determining the supply of wheat for purposes of future acreage allotments and marketing quotas or in determining the level of price support. The committee amendment provides that wheat grown on acreage in excess of acreage allotments (including that produced in noncommercial wheat States where there are no farm allotments) will be counted for such purposes except for the estimated quantity of wheat which is produced on farms taking advantage of the feed exemption provided by this bill."

COUNTING OF EXCESS ACREAGE FOR HISTORY PURPOSES

"The House amendment provided that no acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments would be counted for history purposes in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Because of the House action striking section 3 out of the bill, a change was necessary in this provision in order to leave the noncommercial wheat States in the same position they now occupy. The committee amendment leaves the law with respect to the noncommercial wheat area unchanged and provides that acreage planted to wheat in that area will continue to be counted as history for future acreage acreage allotment purposes.

"Both these amendments were recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its reports to the chairmen of the House and Senate conferees on the bill."

12. POULTRY INSPECTION. Agreed to, and sent to the Senate, the conference report on S. 1747, to provide for the compulsory inspection by this Department of poultry and poultry products. pp. 13738-39

13. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 7900, to authorize the Secretary to sell certain Title III Bankhead-Jones lands in Mich. to private individuals (H. Rept. 1187). p. 13757

14. INFORMATION. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported H.J.Res. 313, designating the week of Nov. 22-28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week. p. D792

Rep. Hoffman criticized the withholding of Government information from Congress and the public. pp. 13746-50

15. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered reported to the full committee without recommendation H.R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. p. D792

16. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 607, to increase the annuities payable to retired employees from the civil service retirement fund. p. D793

17. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The conferees agreed to file a conference report on H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries. p. D793

18. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION. Passed without amendment H.R. 8888, to extend the unemployment compensation program to employees of non-wholly owned Federal instrumentalities of the U.S. pp. 13737-38

19. WATER UTILIZATION. Both Houses received from the Bear River Compact Commission a report relative to negotiations between Ida., Utah, and Wyo. with respect to the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries. pp. 13645, 13757

20. INSECT CONTROL. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment on Aug. 14, S. 1805, to provide relief for persons and firms for the direct expenses incurred by them for fumigation of premises in the control and eradication of the khapra beetle (H. Rept. 1140). p. 13494

21. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following legislative program: Mon., Aug. 19, the Consent Calendar, to be followed by consideration of these bills under suspension of the rules: H.R. 9020, transfer of Packers and Stockyards work to FTC, H.R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures, H.R. 5497, recreational and fish and wildlife development under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, S. 939, the conference report relative to Government transportation services at free or reduced rates, H.R. 5384, relative to preserving competitive through transportation rates for rail carriers; Tues., the AEC appropriation bill; Wed., a resolution for consideration of H.R. 6127, the civil rights bill, if reported by the Rules Committee by that time. pp. 13740, 13744

22. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 19. p. 13757

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. PERSONNEL. Sen. Mansfield inserted W. P. McCahill's, Secretary, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, recent address, "Employment in Professions and Industries." pp. A6735-6

24. INDUSTRIAL USES. Rep. Avery inserted a statement describing the organization of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, and pointing out certain recommendations concerned with the financing and administration of the program. pp. A6737-40

25. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Sen. Yarborough inserting an article, "Drought Again Rears Ugly Head in Southwest Areas," and stating that "these signs underscore the urgency for helping the stricken farmers in the stricken areas." p. A6741

Rep. May inserted an editorial, "The Drought, The Surplus, and Foreign Assistance." p. A6753

26. HOG PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jensen stating that "farmers hold the key to future hog prices," and inserting a table showing pig crop and average farm price at point of first sale from 1940 to 1957. p. A6742

Extension of remarks of Rep. Laird stating that "agricultural research has shown hog producers how to meet consumer demand for lean pork and to cut the fat surplus at the same time." pp. A6769-70

85TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 1180

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

AUGUST 16, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 959]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:*

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or any subsequent year on the following conditions:

"(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: Provided, however, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State or county institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all

regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm and the estimated production from such excess acreage shall not be included in total supply and normal supply in the determination of future marketing quotas and level of price support. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no acreage in the commercial wheat-producing area seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The planting on a farm in the commercial wheat-producing area of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or".

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
CARL ALBERT,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H. R. 8456 as passed by the House on August 2, 1957. The bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment, which has been agreed upon by the conferees. It differs in only two substantial respects from the House amendment.

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT ON EXCESS ACREAGE

The House amendment provided that no wheat produced from any acreage in excess of acreage allotments should be considered in determining the supply of wheat for purposes of future acreage allotments and marketing quotas or in determining the level of price support. The committee amendment provides that wheat grown on acreage in excess of acreage allotments (including that produced in noncommercial wheat States where there are no farm allotments) will be counted for such purposes except for the estimated quantity of wheat which is produced on farms taking advantage of the feed exemption provided by this bill.

COUNTING OF EXCESS ACREAGE FOR HISTORY PURPOSES

The House amendment provided that no acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments would be counted for history purposes in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Because of the House action striking section 3 out of the bill, a change was necessary in this provision in order to leave the noncommercial wheat States in the same position they now occupy. The committee amendment leaves the law with respect to the noncommercial wheat area unchanged and provides that acreage planted to wheat in that area will continue to be counted as history for future acreage allotment purposes.

Both these amendments were recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its reports to the chairmen of the House and Senate conferees on the bill.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
CARL ALBERT,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

ment provides that the bonds shall bear interest at a rate of not more than 6 percent per annum. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill permitted the Armory Board to operate or contract for the operation of concessions for the sale of nonalcoholic beverages at the stadium. This Senate amendment strikes out the word "nonalcoholic." The House recedes.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 1520.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1181)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1520) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 2 of the Act approved August 6, 1956, entitled 'An Act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes', Public Law 996, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, is hereby amended by adding the following: '*And provided further*, That in lieu of preparing dam numbered 3 on the Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, for abandoning, such funds may be expended for modification of the lock and restoration for said dam either as a movable or fixed type dam, but not to exceed $112,500, contingent upon local interests furnishing such additional funds as may be necessary and agreeing to accept the property and take over operation and maintenance of said structure.'"

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBT. S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1520) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to S. 1520 authorized the expenditure of Federal funds, not to exceed $50,000, to reconstruct lock and dam No. 3 on the Little Kanawha River, W. Va., in lieu of preparing the structure for abandonment, with local interests to assume operation and maintenance of the structure after its restoration. The conference substitute is identical with the House amendment, with the exception that the amount of Federal funds authorized to be expended is increased from $50,000 to $112,500.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 7900 and S. 1962.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ALBERT (on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1180)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this Act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1958 or any subsequent year on the following conditions:

"'(1) That the total wheat acreage on the farm does not exceed 30 acres: *Provided, however*, That this condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as part of State or county institutions or religious or eleemosynary institutions;

"'(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services;

"'(3) That such entire crop of wheat is used on such farm for seed, human food, or feed for livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm; and

"'(4) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this Act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm and the estimated production from such excess acreage shall not be included in total supply and normal supply in the determination of future marketing quotas and level of price support. No producer exempted under this section shall be eligible to vote in the referendum under section 336 with respect to the next subsequent crop of wheat.'

"SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no acreage in the commercial wheat-producing area seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of acreage allotments shall be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The planting on a farm in the commercial wheat-producing area of wheat of the 1958 or any subsequent crop for which no farm wheat acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment as a new farm under the second sentence of such subsection.'

"SEC. 3. Section 114 of the Soil Bank Act (70 Stat. 196) is amended by changing clause (2) in the first sentence thereof to read as follows: '(2) in the case of a farm which is not exempted from marketing quota penalties under section 335 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or'."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
CARL ALBERT,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H. R. 8456 as passed by the House on August 2, 1957. The

bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment which has been agreed upon by the conferees. It differs in only two substantial respects from the House amendment.

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT ON EXCESS ACREAGE

The House amendment provided that no wheat produced from any acreage in excess of acreage allotments should be considered in determining the supply of wheat for purposes of future acreage allotments and marketing quotas or in determining the level of price support. The committee amendment provides that wheat grown on acreage in excess of acreage allotments (including that produced in noncommercial wheat States where there are no farm allotments) will be counted for such purposes except for the estimated quantity of wheat which is produced on farms taking advantage of the feed exemption provided by this bill.

COUNTING OF EXCESS ACREAGE FOR HISTORY PURPOSES

The House amendment provided that no acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments would be counted for history purposes in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Because of the House action striking section 3 out of the bill, a change was necessary in this provision in order to leave the noncommercial wheat States in the same position they now occupy. The committee amendment leaves the law with respect to the noncommercial wheat area unchanged and provides that acreage planted to wheat in that area will continue to be counted as history for future acreage allotment purposes.

Both these amendments were recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its reports to the chairmen of the House and Senate conferees on the bill.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
CARL ALBERT,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I could not be on the floor when a vote was taken on the bill S. 1386. I was paired for the bill with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted and the name of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER], be substituted in the permanent RECORD, as he has stated he was for the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

DECLINING RURAL MAIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Vrginia [Mr. STAGGERS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, agree with those who have spoken on the services of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. He has contributed much to our American way of life and when he leaves the Congress, I am sure he leaves with the good wishes of all Members.

For the past 5 years we have been deluged with press releases and press statements from the Post Office Department describing improvements in the postal service. We have had it dinned into our ears by Madison Avenue propagandists that the postal service has been improved in many ways.

From where I stand, the only improvements that I have noted are that the trucks and mail boxes are now painted red, white and blue. The trucks are pretty now; pretty slow, pretty late, and pretty infrequent. The improved postal service is a mirage; as you approach it, it ebbs and fades—this is particularly true when you come to the rural service. Mark it well—I am not blaming the postal employees, who are underpaid and overworked. I am blaming management that follows pennywise and pound foolish policies. The administration that has set up a triple set of administrative officials from one end of the country to the other. Country post offices have become parade grounds for a host of regional officials, district officials, management engineers and others. It takes several people to supervise the work of one. Perhaps that is why the Post Office Department has found it necessary to cut the star route service, the number of fourth-class post offices, and the number of rural routes. These highly paid engineers and managers have to do something to justify their existence, so instead of letting well enough alone, they parade the country crippling postal operations.

In all the time I have served in this body, I have never received as many complaints on postal service as I have recently. Every day brings a complaint—a star route is eliminated; the mail arrives at a later hour; a rural route is eliminated; more delays. A fourth-class post office is discontinued, striking a death knell to the center of a good wholesome rural American community. The savings are infinitesimal, the confusion tremendous.

I suggest that we put some of these confusion experts to work and restore a few rural and star routes. I suggest that we discontinue cutting down and eliminating fourth-class post offices. There were 75 fourth-class post offices closed in 1956. What are we trying to do—eliminate rural America? Are we going to adopt the Russian collectivist system, where people are herded in cities and go out to the farms? Or are we going to protect and preserve the wholesome, individually owned American farm? I deplore this hard-booted attitude of the Post Office Department that is crushing out essential elements in rural America.

Testifying on mounted routes before the Appropriations Committee of the House, Mr. Hahn of the Post Office Department told the committee that they were cutting out 50 star routes in 1958. He also made the following comment:

> The reduction in the number of routes is brought about not by the reduction of service but by consolidation of routes. Each time the contract on a route expires, we make a careful investigation in the area with a view of consolidating where we can do so, so as a general rule such consolidations permit reductions in our overall costs.

I have news for Mr. Hahn—the reduction in the number of routes has brought a reduction in service. I have it on the word of the people in my district who complain with righteous indignation of the service they are receiving.

For the past 5 years Postmaster General Summerfield has vainly sought an increase in postage rates. I have some suggestions that he might follow if he is to secure such an increase. First, give the American people better postal service and fewer press releases. Second, give the American people more men to deliver the mail and fewer people to foul up the operations with layer on top of layer of duplicated management. The American people would be willing to pay higher postage rates for better postal service; but they will certainly object to paying higher rates for the present fading postal service.

I want to again emphasize, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that it is the fault of this administration that we are living in the age of "mail confusion" and Mr. Postmaster General Summerfield is doing little to correct the situation. Again and again I have urged that the mail service be retained as the patrons want it. Not changed at the whim of the top echelon so that another news release can be sent out.

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, since June 9, 1955, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been making investigations holding hearings in connection with the alleged refusal of the executive departments to give to the public, to individuals, to Members of Congress, and congressional committees, information in the custody of the departments.

The committee has an active, competent, industrious staff and has had the assistance of those who engaged in collecting, publishing, and distributing news as a commercial venture. Beyond question, the investigations and the hearings which have been held, as well as others which will be held, have been conducive to a better understanding of the desirability of a wider dissemination of information, as well as of the necessity of protecting of information through suppression, where indiscriminate rules or any rules at all might endanger the national welfare.

The testimony taken has been and undoubtedly will continue to be of almost inestimable value, not only to the public at large, but to the departments and those who control and direct their operation.

The investigations and the hearings apparently started with the query as to what legal authority the departments relied upon when a refusal was made to divulge particular information. Counsel

Aug. 19, 1957

12. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N.J., inserted four editorials criticizing the House cuts in the mutual security appropriation bill. pp. 1781-2

13. DISASTER-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Cooper urged support for the committee amendment to H.R. 9131, to provide $25 million to meet the emergency conservation needs of rural areas struck by natural disasters. p. 13788

14. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Sen. Clark proposed a substitute for S. 2377, to provide for the production of statements and reports by witnesses, which would require the Government to bring forward statements of prospective witnesses before they were to testify, and grant the trial court authority to determine its actions if such were not done. pp. 13788-9

15. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Sparkman inserted an Ala. Legislature resolution urging the repeal of the excise taxes on transportation. p. 13760

16. GOVERNMENT COMPETITION. The Select Small Business Committee submitted a report, "Government Competition With Private Business" (S. Rept. 1015). pp. 13760-1

17. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced there would be a call of the calendar for the passage of unobjected-to bills today, Aug. 20.. pp. 13784, 13792

HOUSE

18. WHEAT. Agreed to the conference report on S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced. pp. 13908-09

19. MEATPACKERS. Reps. Mack and Hagen expressed gratification that consideration of H.R. 9020, to transfer certain work under the Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC, had been postponed, and expressed the hope that the measure would not be considered until next year. pp. 13900-03

20. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 939, relative to rendering transportation services to the Government at free or reduced rates. The bill as agreed to amends Sec. 22 (providing for Government transportation services at free or reduced rates) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide that Sec. 22 quotations issued by carriers must be filed immediately with the ICC in order that they can be made available to the general public, and also includes a provision making Sec. 5a of the ICC Act, which authorizes immunity from the antitrust laws of carriers under certain conditions, applicable to all Sec. 22 quotations made to the Federal Government. pp. 13903-06

Passed, under suspension of the rules, H.R. 5384, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the preservation of competitive through routes for rail carriers. pp. 13882-83

21. ATOMIC ENERGY. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 8996, authorizing appropriations for AEC to acquire or construct power reactor facilities. (p. 13842) Senate conferees were appointed Aug. 16.

Concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 7383, to provide Governmental indemnity and limitations on private liability for atomic energy hazards of certain licensees (p. 13842). This bill will now be sent to the President.

22. WATER RESOURCES. Conferees were appointed on S. 1482, to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act so as to increase the limitation on the acreage which one family might have of irrigated land (p. 13843). Senate conferees were appointed Aug. 15.

23. RECLAMATION. Passed as reported H.R. 6940, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses. p. 13846

24. CONSERVATION. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Byrnes, Wisc., S.J.Res. 35, to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection of the natural resources of the U. S.. p. 13853

25. FORESTRY. Passed as reported H.R. 580, to authorize the exchange of certain land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service with Mo.. p. 13853

26. WATER UTILIZATION. Passed with amendment H.R. 8465, to grant consent to the Klamath River Basin compact between Calif. and Ore.. pp. 13869-73

27. WATERSHEDS. Rejected, 45 to 80, a motion by Rep. Cooley to consider under suspension of the rules H.R. 5497, to subject recreational and fish and wildlife development projects to certain conditions in order to receive Federal assistance under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. pp. 13888-92

28. COTTON. Passed without amendment H.R. 6765, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions. p. 13853

29. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H.R. 4640, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit persons transferring to non-Act positions to retain voluntary contribution accounts. p. 13854

30. APPOINTMENTS. Rep. Halleck commended the appointment of Dr. Harry J. Reed, recently retired dean and director of the Purdue Univ. School of Agriculture, as the USDA coordinator of the rural development program. p. 13909

31. CENSUS. Passed without amendment S. 1631, to amend various sections of the U.S. Code entitled "Census" (pp. 13860-61). This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H.R. 7911, was tabled.

32. WATER POLLUTION. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Byrnes, Wisc., H.R. 6701, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Tenn. River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact. pp. 13861-62

33. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. Passed as reported H.R. 8429, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to extend the time in which grants may be made to the States for vocational rehabilitation program expansion. p. 13862

34. INFORMATION. Passed without amendment H.J.Res. 313, designating the week of Nov. 22 to 28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week (p. 13906. This measure was reported without amendment earlier by the Judiciary Committee (H. Rept. 1194) (p. 13916).

35. MILK PRICES. Rep. Christopher objected to the necessity for holding hearings before the price of milk in the Md.-Va. area could be increased, pointing out that such hearings were not required before the prices of steel and gasoline were increased. p. 13842

to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

SEC. 4. If the State of Nevada purchases under this act any lands which are subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended (39 U. S. C. 181 and the following), it shall be required to purchase all the lands subject to that lease, permit, license, or contract which are included within the boundaries of the lands described in section 1. The purchase of lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract shall neither affect the validity nor modify the terms of the lease, permit, license, or contract in any way, or affect any rights thereunder, except that the State shall assume the position of the United States thereunder, including any right to rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing on or after the date on which the purchase by the State becomes effective, and any right to modify terms or conditions of such leases, permits, licenses, or contracts.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "that, as used in this act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) The term 'Commission' shall mean the Colorado River Commission of the State of Nevada.

"(c) The term 'State' shall mean the State of Nevada.

"(d) The term 'transfer area' shall mean all lands or interests in lands owned by the United States and located within the exterior boundaries of the area described in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to segregate from all forms of entry under the public land laws of the United States, during a period of 5 years from and after the effective date of this act, the following described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 126,775 acres:

"(1) All of south half, township 23 south, range 63 east, with the exception of the following areas: east half section 22; 4 5-acre tracts located in section 26 and described as follows: south half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter north half southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter and south half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; and those portions of the northeast quarter section 23, and north half section 24, within the Lake Mead national recreation area.

"(2) Fractional sections 25 and 36, township 23 south, range 63½ east.

"(3) All of sections 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, township 23 south, range 64 east.

"(4) Fractional sections 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, township 23½ south, range 64 east.

"(5) All of southeast quarter of township 24 south, range 62 east.

"(6) All of township 24 south, range 63 east.

"(7) All of township 24 south, range 64 east, except sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36.

"(8) All of township 25 south, range 62 east.

"(9) All of township 25 south, range 63 east.

"(10) All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 25 south, range 64 east.

"(11) All of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14, township 26 south, range 62 east.

"(12) All of northwest quarter, township 26 south, range 63 east.

"All range references contained in the foregoing refer to the Mount Diablo base and meridian.

"SEC. 3. The Commission, acting on behalf of the State, is hereby given the option, after compliance with all of the provisions of this act and any regulations promulgated hereunder, of having patented to the State by the Secretary all or portions of the lands within the transfer area. Such option may be exercised at any time during the 5-year period of segregation established in section 2, but the filing of any application for the conveyance of title to any lands within the transfer area, if received by the Secretary from the Commission prior to the expiration of such period, shall have the effect of extending the period of segregation of such lands from all forms of entry under the public land laws until such application is finally disposed of by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. Prior to conveying any lands or interests in lands of the United States to the State, the Commission and the Secretary shall comply with the requirements set out following:

"(a) The Commission, within 1 year after the effective date of this act, shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development for the entire transfer area, which plan shall include but need not be limited to the general terms and conditions under which individuals, governmental agencies or subdivisions, corporations, associations, or other legal entities may acquire rights, title, or interests in and to lands within the transfer area.

"(b) At any time after submission of a proposed plan for the entire transfer area, as required by the preceding subsection, the Commission may select for transfer from Federal to State ownership such land units within the transfer area as contain not less than 18 sections of land in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the land involved. All applications for transfer of title to any such land unit shall be made to the Secretary and shall be accompanied by a development and acquisition planning report containing such information relative to any proposed development and acquisition payment plan as may by regulation be required by the Secretary. No acquisition payment plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless such plan provides for payment by the State into the Treasury of the United States, within 5 years of the delivery of patent to the Commission, of an amount equal to the appraised fair market value of the lands conveyed.

"(c) Upon receipt of any application for transfer of title to any land unit the Secretary shall cause an appraisal to be made of the fair market value of the lands within the unit proposed to be transferred, including mineral and material values, if any, but in arriving at such value the Secretary shall not include factors reflecting enhancement of the value of the lands within the unit involved by reason of development or improvement of other lands within the transfer area which have previously been patented to the State.

"(d) As soon as a proposed unit development and acquisition planning report is found by the Secretary to comply with the provisions of this act and with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe as to the contents thereof, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate a contract of sale with the Commission and to prepare appropriate conveyancing instruments for the lands involved.

"Thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress for reference to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, copies of the Commission application, proposed unit development and acquisition planning report, and proposed contract of sale and conveyancing instruments, together with his comments and recommendations, if any.

"(e) No contract of sale or instrument of conveyance shall be executed by the Secretary with respect to any lands applied for by the Commission prior to 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 calendar days to a day certain) from the day on which the Secretary makes the submissions required by the preceding subsection, unless the Congress, prior to the expiration of said 60 days, approves the execution of such contract of sale and instrument of conveyance.

"SEC. 5. The conveyance or conveyances authorized by this act shall be made subject to any existing valid rights pertaining to the lands included within the transfer area.

"SEC. 6. If the State selects and purchases under this act any lands which are subject on the date the purchase by the State becomes effective to a lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended (39 U. S. C. 181 and the following), the State shall be required to purchase all the lands subject to that lease, permit, license, or contract which are included within the boundaries of the transfer area. The purchase of lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract shall neither affect the validity nor modify the terms of the lease, permit, license, or contract in any way, or affect any rights thereunder, except that the State shall assume the position of the United States thereunder, including any right to rental, royalties, and other payments accruing on or after the date on which the purchase by the State becomes effective, and any right to modify the terms or conditions of such leases, permits, licenses, or contracts.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this act. He shall give particular attention in so doing to including in any conveyancing instruments executed under the authority of this act such provisions as will in his judgment protect existing or future uses by the United States of lands within the transfer area, including, but not limited to, provision for reversion of title therein to the United States upon failure of the State or its successors in interest to strictly comply with the terms and conditions of any such conveyancing instrument. In establishing any future Federal easements, however, no lands shall be included upon which substantial improvements have been placed by the State or its successor in interest."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO IMPLEMENT THE TREATY AGREEMENT WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. BONNER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6709), an act to implement a treaty agreement with the Republic of Panama:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1196)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) To implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as

follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA AND FISCAL ADJUSTMENTS BY PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

"SEC. 101. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of this title—

"(1) to authorize and direct the fulfillment of those provisions of the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama signed on January 25, 1955, and of the memorandum of understandings reached signed on the same date, which contemplate, subject to authorization by the Congress, the conveyance of various lands and improvements to the Republic of Panama, including, but not limited to, conveyance of the lands and improvements in, and simultaneous relinquishment of all right, power and authority in, the area known as Paitilla Point, and including the removal of the railway terminal operations of the Panama Canal Company from the city of Panama and the conveyance of the lands and improvements known as Panama Railroad Yard in the city of Panama; and

"(2) to authorize and provide for the adjustments in the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company necessitated by the aforesaid conveyances.

"SEC. 102. (a) In accordance with and subject to the provisions of article V of the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama signed on January 25, 1955, and item 2 of the memorandum of understandings reached signed on same date—

"(1) the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to convey to the Republic of Panama free of cost all the right, title, and interest held by the United States of America or its agencies in and to the land and improvements in the area known as Paitilla Point and in the areas designated in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of paragraph (a) of said item 2; and

"(2) the Panama Canal Company is authorized and directed to remove its operations and withdraw from the other lands and improvements designated in said item 2, and to convey to the Republic of Panama free of cost all the right, title, and interest held by the Panama Canal Company and the United States of America in and to said other lands and improvements.

"(b) The market value of the property of the Panama Canal Company conveyed under this directive or by operation of articles VI or VII of the treaty and the net capital loss, if any, as established by the Panama Canal Company and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, sustained in the disposal, relocation, or reutilization of any facility or other property of the Panama Canal Company rendered excess, wholly or in part, by operation of articles V or XII of the treaty or items 2, 6, 9, or 10 of the memorandum of understandings reached shall be treated as extraordinary expenditures and losses incurred through directives based on national policy and not related to the operations of the corporation, within the meaning of section 246 (d) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the Act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 706, 62 Stat. 1075). The market value of Canal Zone Government property conveyed under this directive shall be removed from the capital investment of the United States in the Canal Zone Government without charge to the costs of operation of that agency. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be required for the necessary replacement of property or facilities of the Panama Canal Company or Canal Zone Governmnent conveyed or rendered excess as the result of the treaty or memorandum, such amounts to be charged to the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government, respectively.

And the Senate agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill as passed by the House added a provision allocating to the Panama Canal Company the payment of an increase in the annuity paid by the United States to the Republic of Panama pursuant to the Treaty of January 25, 1955. It was agreed at the Conference that this matter of internal accounting as between the Treasury and the Panama Canal Company should more properly be the subject of a separate bill.

The Senate amendment to the House bill contained section numbers that it was believed should be retained.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1957.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the wheat bill which the conferees have brought back to the House is a measure in which all who have any part in it may well take some degree of satisfaction. It is a good bill. It gives small livestock and poultry producers of the Eastern States a degree of flexibility in growing wheat for their own use as feed and its does so with a minimum of damage to the commercial wheat area.

The bill represents a great deal of work on the part of the Committee on Agriculture that has extended over a period of many months. It is a compromise bill which is essentially satisfactory to all the parties involved. The bill accepted by the conferees and reported to the House is substantially the bill which was passed by the House a little over 2 weeks ago. It will permit any farmer—whether he has a wheat allotment or not—to grow up to 30 acres of wheat on his farm if all of the wheat produced on this acreage is used on the farm for livestock feed, human food, or seed. The 30-acre limitation will not apply to farms operated by State and county or eleemosynary institutions. Neither the acreage nor the production from the farms receiving this exemption will be counted for future acreage allotment, marketing quota, and price support purposes.

The bill also provides, Mr. Speaker, that in the commercial wheat area none of the acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments, beginning with the 1958 crop, will be counted for future acreage allotment and marketing quota purposes. This provision is of great importance to the commercial wheat producers—the farmers who depend upon wheat for their livelihood. It is the same kind of a provision which already applies to most other allotted crops and will prevent the constant and very appreciable leeching away of the wheat allotment from the areas where wheat is a major crop into the areas where it is only a secondary or incidental crop. This has occurred in the past because of the fact that farmers in those areas were able to acquire wheat acreage history by planting in excess of their allotments, either under the 15-acre exemption or by simply overplanting their allotment and paying the penalty.

With respect to the noncommercial wheat States, the bill should also be satisfactory since it makes no change whatever in the present provisions of law relating to the noncommercial wheat area. Farmers in the noncommercial wheat States will continue, as long as their State allotment is less than 25,000 acres, to be eligible to plant all the wheat they want to plant without acreage allotments and will continue to receive credit for history purposes for the acreage which is planted to wheat for harvest as grain. When the State allotment exceeds 25,000 acres the State will automatically be classified as within the commercial wheat area and farms in that State will receive farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas pursuant to the provisions of existing law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might also state that this bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture, came out of conference with the Senate conferees unanimously.

The bill simply permits the planting of 30 acres without penalty by a farmer who wants to feed that wheat on his own farm to his family or to his livestock. It is a good bill and should be passed.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, there are no objections, to our knowledge, to this piece of legislation, and it does give the farmers who wish to grow 30 acres of wheat and feed it on the farm a proposi-

tion under which they may grow as many bushels to the acre as they please on the 30, but they must feed it on the farm. That is the idea I had in mind.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, we should also say something about the counting of excess acreage for historical purposes. The wheat people had always been interested in the excess acres, the growers of a considerable number of acres. This bill takes care of the large wheatgrower; and, as far as I know, no one objects to the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Will this measure in any way interfere with the present arrangement by which 15 acres of wheat can be grown for sale?

Mr. ALBERT. The 15-acre provision remains in the law unchanged except that it is subject to the provision that no acreage in excess of allotments can be considered in establishing future allotments.

Fifteen acres of wheat may be grown on any farm for any purpose; and the wheat may be sold, fed, or disposed of in any other manner.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. This comes as a very great relief to me and my farmers. In my congressional district we raise a great deal of poultry, and it is a great dairy region. The farms are not large, but the farmers have been greatly embarrassed by certain people up there who hauled them into court and sent them to jail for violation of this iniquitous law.

I congratulate the Committee on Agriculture for bringing this relief to these farmers who richly deserve it.

It will be a source of gratification to the farmers in my congressional district to know that today legislation passed the House to lift the stigma from those who raise wheat to feed their own livestock and poultry. The farmers can now raise 30 acres of wheat and feed it to their own cattle and poultry without being subject to a fine and imprisonment.

This iniquitous New Deal law ought to have been wiped clean from the statute books, but to relieve the farmers, in part, is a real benefit.

I introduced the first bill to bring about this relief.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I can state that the gentleman has been one of those most interested in this legislation for several years, to my personal knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. HARRY J. REED AS COORDINATOR OF THE COOPERATIVE FEDERAL-STATE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of Members of this body the appointment today of Dr. Harry J. Reed, recently retired dean and director of the Purdue University School of Agriculture as the new coordinator for the cooperative Federal-State-rural development program.

Dean Reed comes to his assignment in Washington to continue a distinguished career of service to farmers both in this country and abroad.

The appointment is particularly gratifying to me since Purdue University is located in the district it is my privilege to represent here in the House.

But, beyond that, may I say that in my opinion, the Honorable Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, has made an excellent choice to coordinate this far-reaching program which, we believe, will prove highly beneficial to the lowest income people in rural areas.

Dean Reed is a man who knows agriculture, its problems and its potentials.

He has been a farm manager, a county agricultural agent, and has risen in the ranks from a member of the Purdue faculty to the position of dean of the School of Agriculture, a post he held for 18 years.

Among his many activities and honors are the following: Chairman, National Institute of Animal Agriculture, International Livestock Exposition, and International Dairy Exposition; member of National Advisory Committee on Agricultural Research and Marketing, United States Department of Agriculture; Indiana Economic Council, American Academy of Political and Social Science, and Indiana Conservation Commission. He was leader of the United States Wheat Mission to Pakistan in 1953 and in 1954 he headed the United States Agricultural Trade Mission to South America.

As chairman of the Indiana State Rural Development Committee, Dean Reed has had firsthand experience with the planning and organization of rural development activities in that State, where a pilot operation has been established in Perry County.

There is nothing of the armchair expert about Dean Reed as far as the subject of agriculture is concerned.

I recall him best as a fellow who is ready to come to even the smallest farm meeting if he feels there is a chance to contribute something constructive to the solution of a local problem. For all the important assignments he has been given—and which he has discharged most ably—Dean Reed has kept his roots close to the people he serves so well.

I share the confidence expressed in Dean Reed's energy and ability by President Eisenhower, and I believe, with the President, that under Dr. Reed's guidance, this new program will help our lowest-income rural families to obtain a greater portion of our history-making peacetime prosperity.

STEPHEN FOSTER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Stephen Foster Memorial Commission in Florida called my attention to the censorship of Stephen Foster songs as they are used on television and radio. I checked upon their complaint and found that it is absolutely true. Representatives of the major television stations have admitted that for a period of some years they have followed a policy of changing words so as not to offend a minority group. In my reply to the letters from the television networks, I pointed out that I did not believe there was a majority of any minority group that objected to the original words of Stephen Foster. As I am sure my colleagues know, Stephen Foster wrote of the days of slavery and his songs paid tribute to the Negro in a beautiful and loving manner. Specifically, the television and radio networks have deleted such words as "darkey," "massa," etc., because again according to their ideas they believed these words to be objectionable to our fine Negro citizens.

Congressmen CHELF and WATTS, of Kentucky, along with Congressman SIKES and myself from Florida, called this matter to the attention of the House several weeks ago. Since that time various bills and resolutions have been introduced by the above Members of Congress to direct a thorough study of this matter.

Just this past week, one of our citizens from the District of Columbia came to my office to point out how the words of Stephen Foster songs have been changed in the songbooks used in the District of Columbia. Now to be objective, I must say that I have also heard reports from throughout the whole United States to the effect that in various songbooks throughout the country, the words of Stephen Foster have been changed.

I have hastily checked dozens of songbooks used in the District of Columbia and to amplify this point I think it would be of interest to point out certain facts of what we might call "book censorship."

In Music, Highways and Byways, by McConathy Beattie, and Morgan, part of the Music Hour Series, copyrighted in 1936 and published by the Silver Burdett Co., on page 20 of that book we find the words of Ring, Ring the Banjo by Stephen Collins Foster. In the first line of the first stanza we find the correct words as Foster wrote them as follows: "The time is never dreary, if the darky never groans." Now, if we examine the book entitled "Singing in Harmony" by Pitts, Glenn, and Watters, copyrighted in 1951 and published by Ginn & Co., we will note on page 14 the words of the song Ring, Ring the Banjo by Stephen C. Foster. The first line of the first

stanza in that version reads, "The time is never dreary, if a fellow never groans." You see, the word "fellow" is substituted for "darky." In passing, I should like to point out that in this same book on page 91 we find the word of My Old Kentucky Home, by Stephen C. Foster. As we start the first stanza, we read "The sun shines bright in the old Kentucky home, 'tis summer, a time to be gay." Those of you who are familiar with the words of Stephen C. Foster will recall that, instead of "a time to be gay," Foster said "the darkies are gay." In fact, if you go to the songbook entitled "Merry Music" by Armitage, Dykema, & Pitcher, copyrighted in 1939 and published by C. C. Birchard & Co., of Boston, you will find that on page 167 we have the correct words of My Old Kentucky Home and we find in the first stanza, the words, "The sun shines bright on my old Kentucky home, 'tis summer, the darkies are gay."

In World Music Horizons of the New Music series edited by McConathy, Morgan, and so forth, published by the Silver Burdett Co. and copyrighted in 1951, you find on page 22 the beautiful song by Stephen Collins Foster entitled "Massa's in the Cold, Cold Ground." In the first stanza you find the words "Round the meadows am a ringing the darkey's mournful song" which is correct. But in what must have been a second publishing of the same edition, on page 22 of the same book with the same authors and the same copyright date, you find that the words in "Massa's in the Cold, Cold Ground" start out as follows, "Round the meadows am a ringing the old ones mournful song." In the song book Singing Along in the World of Music series, copyrighted 1952, edited by Glenn, Leavitt, and Rebmann, and published by Ginn & Co., on page 148 you find "Massa's in the Cold, Cold Ground" by Stephen Foster and the first stanza begins, "Round the meadows am a ringing the people's mournful song." The Florida State song is "Old Folks at Home," by Stephen C. Foster, and in the chorus we have the words "O darkies, how my heart grows weary." In the song book Siging Together, by Pitts, Glenn, and Watters, published by Ginn & Co., with the copyright date of 1951, we find on page 70 the words in the chorus have been changed to "O loved ones, how my heart grows weary." In the book the American Singer, 2d edition, edited by Baettie, Wolverton, Wilson, and Hanger, and copyrighted in 1954 by the American Book Co., we find that on page 15 the words have been changed to "O brothers, how my heart grows weary." So we go in this series from "darkies" to "loved ones" to "brothers." In the book, Music Americans Sing, by Wilson, Leeder, and Ghee, copyrighted by the Silver Burdett Co. in 1948, on page 54 we find the words of the official State song of the State of Virginia "Carry Me Back to Ole Virginny" has been changed. In the first stanza, instead of the words "There's where this ole darkey's heart am longed to go" we find the words "There's where this ole heart of mine am longed to go." In this same book on page 45 in the words to the song "In the Evening by the Moonlight" we find the first stanza begins "In the evening by the moonlight, there are silver voices singing." As I recall, we used to sing this song, "In the evening by the moonlight you can hear those darkies singing." In the book, Let Music Ring, edited by Dykema, Pitcher, and Vandeveare, published by the C. C. Burchard & Co., of Boston, and copyrighted in 1949, on page 142 we find the words of "Southern Memories" begin "In the evening by the moonlight there are silver voices singing." However, in the book Singing Juniors, by Pitts, Glenn, Watters, and Wersen, published by the Ginn & Co. and copyrighted in 1953, we find that the words have been changed from "silver voices" to "you could hear those young folks singing." Now the authorship of this particular medley is uncertain so in all fairness I think it should be assumed that perhaps we should grant some privilege in changing these particular words in the medley "In the Evening by the Moonlight."

Incidentally, in recent editions of songbooks used in District schools, I could not find a copy of Foster's Old Black Joe. I cannot understand why the words of Stephen C. Foster, a dead author, have been changed. His words were carefully selected. He wanted to pay tribute to the songs and people of his time. He wanted particularly to pay tribute to the folksongs of the Negro. These songs are one of the great traditions of America, and I think it is improper censorship to change the words of these songs—all of which have a delicate and proper shading that Foster understood.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about book burning. It would seem to me that this type of censorship is to a certain extent "book burning." What I want to do is to call to the attention of the American people these facts and to hope that we shall be guided by the history and the facts of these songs as we sing them in the future.

I am introducing a bill which is similar to bills introduced by Congressman CHELF, of Kentucky, and I believe Congressman HERLONG, from Florida. My bill may differ in some details from theirs, but the purpose of it is to ask the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to look into this whole matter. I think now we should look into not only the censorship of television and radio stations of the works of Stephen Foster, but we should also look upon the censorship that we find practiced in certain books.

NEED FOR A SISTER SHIP TO THE STEAMSHIP "UNITED STATES"

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the construction of a sister ship to that great flagship of the American merchant marine, the steamship *United States.*

On August 30, 1939, a great and significant event occurred. The steamship *America*, the first passenger vessel to be built under the farsighted provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, was launched. Two days later, on September 1, Germany and Russia invaded Poland, and World War II was furiously underway in Europe. Time was on our side, and this great ship was able to be completed for valiant service as the troopship renamed *West Point*, by the time the United States became involved in the conflict. Unfortunately, she was only one ship—when many were needed.

It is a lesson of history that many of us tend to forget that the lack of an adequate operating American-flag merchant marine, capable of serving as military and naval auxiliary, forced this country into a vast and tremendously expensive emergency shipbuilding program. This lack compelled us to depend upon the dangerous expedients of slow, cramped, and unsafe conversion of cargo ships to provide urgently needed troop-lift capability, or to make expensive arrangements for troop transport on the vessels of our allies.

Since World War II, there have been built in this country only three new passenger vessels to serve the growing needs of our waterborne commerce and to be available in time of national emergency. One of these is the great ship the *United States*, which with the 18-year-old *America*, is 1 of only 2 American passenger ships plying the North Atlantic. Yet the demand for passenger space is growing by leaps and bounds and other nations are building new, modern vessels for the service as fast as they can.

By 1960, the *America* is due for replacement and all indications are that the needs of the service as well as the national interests—both from the standpoint of national defense and national prestige—require that the replacement vessel should be equivalent to, or a sister ship of, the *United States*.

I do not believe it necessary to dwell at length upon the virtues of the steamship *United States*, either as a symbol of this Nation's dominating role in the foreign commerce of the world, or of the tremendous value which she has in terms of our national defense. During the past 5 years, great numbers of American tourists have traveled on this ship and millions of others have come to regard it with much the same reverence and respect accorded other superior accomplishments of this country in competition with the countries of the world.

None can dispute the inestimable value of this magnificent ship as a national asset—nor deny the return on the Government's investment which made her construction possible. Yet, many will recall that at the time she was built grave doubts were raised over the adequacy of the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to authorize her construction and sale to the United States Lines under the terms which were agreed upon.

While the controversy which arose over the building of the *United States* was eventually settled, the doubts concerning the adequacy of existing law to authorize the construction and sale of such a superliner passenger ship under

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 21, 1957
For actions of August 20, 1957
85th-1st, No. 151

CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on bill to exempt from quotas wheat used on farm where produced. House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee announced it had annulled proposed favorable report on onion futures bill. Senate committee reported bills to sell surplus cotton to U.S. mills, and to provide for greater State participation in disaster relief. Sens. Humphrey and Carroll criticized Secretary for failure to testify on REA loan authority; Sen. Allott defended Secretary.

HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1958. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 9131 (H. Rept. 1207)(pp. 14026-30). As reported the bill provides $4 million for ARS for eradication of screwworms and fireants (instead of $5 million as proposed by the Senate). The amount of $3.5 million added by the Senate for poultry inspection was reported in disagreement, but the statement of the House managers says a motion will be offered to concur with the Senate amendment, with an amendment to provide $1,300,000 instead of $3.5 million as proposed by the Senate. The item of $25 million for emergency conservation measures was reported in disagreement. The item to authorize the use of not to exceed $50,000 of the funds appropriated for forest land management in 1958 for the acquisition of sites for buildings outside the national forests with other limitation, was reported in disagreement.

2. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 8240, the military housing construction authorization bill, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries (pp. 14030-34). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. ATOMIC ENERGY. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 8996, authorizing appropriations for the AEC to acquire or construct power reactor facilities (pp. 14037-42). The report had been submitted by the conference committee earlier (H. Rept. 1204)(p. 14054).

4. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in either suspending or retaining on duty a Federal employee prior to security hearings (H. Rept. 1201). p. 14054

5. STATION TRANSFERS. A subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee ordered reported S. 1408, to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the U.S. who are transferred from one official station to another. p. D806

6. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1996, to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District and to provide that the excess-land provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to the lands of the Kendrick project, Wyo.. p. D807

7. RICE; FISHERIES. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1552, to develop methods for the commercial production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with rice field crop. p. D807

SENATE

8. WHEAT. Agreed to the conference report on S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced (See Digest 149). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13984-5

9. REA LOANS. Sens. Humphrey, Carroll, Morton, Allott, and Aiken discussed the alleged change in REA loan authority, which Sen. Humphrey contended was a violation of the Secretary's promises when the Reorganization Act was adopted, and Sen. Carroll charged was a basic change in policy violating the REA Act. Sen. Allott defended the Secretary. pp. 13998-14005, 14006-8

10. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Passed with an amendment S. 2757, to authorize construction of the Burns Creek Project, Ida.. The amendment, by Sen. Anderson, provided that all lands acquired within the exterior boundaries of a national forest and not used by the project shall become national forest lands. pp. 13995, 13997-8

11. WATER RESOURCES. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 2431, granting Congressional consent to the Ore.-Calif. compact on the Klamath River Basin. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13992

At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. Con. Res. 28, to authorize the compilation and printing of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River. p. 13947

Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for improvement works on the Bayou Nexipique watershed, La., and the Alamo Arroyo and Diablo Arroyo watershed, Tex.. pp. 13919, 14054

12. ONIONS. The Daily Digest states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee annulled its proposed favorable report without amendment on S. 778, to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges. p. D804

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over for later discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, once before the Senate became involved in this sort of a situation, and the people then interested had to object to every bill remaining on the calendar. I wish we had known about this earlier in the day. We could destroy the calendar in this way.

These Indians have not done anything to the Senator from Delaware to make this procedure necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it looks to me as if threats are being used against bills which have not been called. I sincerely hope that the Senate will reconsider its action, so that the amendment can be agreed to, even under the threatened procedure.

I think the welfare of the Indians, for which the Senator from New Mexico has shown such great interest down through the years should be given priority.

I should like to request, Mr. President, if I may, that the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to H. R. 9023 be reconsidered at this time. I move reconsideration of the vote on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the bills on the calendar. This procedure has happened only one time in the Senate, and happened as a result of actions by a Senator who was badly misinformed.

I subscribe to what the Senator from Montana has stated. I ask that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was rejected. I have no alternative. These Indians are in deep trouble.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

Mr. ANDERSON. The motion has been made that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was rejected be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting minority leader apparently reserves the right to object. The Senator will state his objection.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Chair has not yet announced the result of the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that the "noes" appeared to have it, and was in the process of announcing that the "noes" did have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the bill.

Prior to the announcement of the Chair, I think I had asked that the bill go over. I withdraw that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not recognize the Senator from Delaware at that point, so his request was not a matter of record in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair in putting the question recognized the Senator from New Mexico, who offered the original bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was rejected be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Chair has announced that the "noes" appear to have it, but has not announced that the "noes" do have it. There has not been a pronouncement of a decision on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce that the "noes" do have it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS was rejected.

The PRESIDING CFFICER. The motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected is in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is a motion to reconsider subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is debatable. At the present moment the motion of the Senator from New Mexico should be restated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was rejected be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I have opposed proposed legislation when I felt such action was warranted.

I fully realize that the way to handle this rider is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected, accept the rider and take it to conference, and then eliminate it in conference.

Mr. President, I do not like that procedure. I think we ought to face the problem head-on. Let the Senator from Delaware object to the bill. He proposed the rider. He is making his record. Let the record speak for itself.

Then the majority leader can bring the bill up by motion, when the call of the calendar is over, and we can consider the bill on its merits. Then the Senator from Delaware can offer his rider amendment, and then we can have a vote on the amendment.

I want to say now, Mr. President, that I think we have an obligation to keep the legislative process as pure as we can. Legislation by rider is a legislative impurity. I always have opposed it. I am going to oppose this action.

I cannot stop the Senate from reconsidering the vote, but I will say to the acting majority leader that I urge him to announce to the Senate that if the bill is not passed on the unanimous-consent request, it will be taken up by motion.

I make no threats, Mr. President. I never do that. I simply say, Mr. President, that I will object to the bill with a rider passing on the calendar by unanimous consent, and going to conference.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico, I shall vote for the bill. I want the Senator to understand that. I want the Senator from New Mexico to know that I shall vote for his bill when it comes up on motion. I will not approve of the bill with the rider attached. I think that is a very bad precedent for us to accept, particularly in the closing days of the session when all of us can be beaten around the heads by riders attached to bills. I think we had better stop the practice before it starts.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be more acceptable to the Senator if, in reconsidering the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was rejected, we consider the bill, H. R. 9023, as originally reported, without the amendment?

Mr. MORSE. That is what I want to do, without the rider on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it is not considered that way, I wish to assure the Senator that I shall do my best to call the bill up as soon as the call of the calendar is concluded.

Mr. MORSE. I know that. I am objecting to the rider procedure. I think it is a bad legislative practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the vote will occur on the question of agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say that I also love to battle these things out. Sometimes I am not so full of health as are other Members of the Senate, though I did stay here 8 hours the other day on a bill in which I had a deep interest.

Mr. President, I am not concerned today about myself. I am concerned about these Indians who are in the hospital. I will take the bill to conference, for the benefit of these Indians.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the discussion of all the amendments it should be remembered that I offered an amendment a few minutes ago on a bill previously considered, and other Senators have offered amendments. There is nothing unusual at all about offering amendments. This is not a new procedure.

This is an amendment which was offered in the form of a bill in the early part of January by my colleague and other Senators and was referred to the committee. I have discussed this matter with members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Most of them are familiar with it. We are not attempting to pull any surprise. We merely want a vote on our amendment based upon its merits.

When I said I was going to ask that the bill go over, that was not in the form of a threat, but rather on the theory that the only way we could get a vote would be to carry it over and then, later today, take the bill up by motion.

I will assure the Senator from New Mexico and the majority leader that if we cannot get the amendment agreed to now and the bill is taken up on motion, there will be no undue delay so far as I am concerned in considering the bill on its merits and getting a vote. I will vote for the bill with or without my amendment.

I am not trying to block the bill from that angle. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will be willing to take this amendment to conference with the understanding he now has of it.

I certainly hope we can get the amendment agreed to, because it means a great deal to the people in our area. I recognize the importance of the Senator's bill, but if the amendment is not considered at this session it means the entire industry in our area is finished. This is a seasonal industry and a vote next year will be too late. Either the Senate will act on this matter at this session or nothing at all can be done.

All our people desire is a decision as to whether they should proceed or not.

If it is the wish of the Senate to reject this amendment, let it be known, but I certainly hope that the decision will be favorable.

I repeat—those who buy these wreaths from the makers and ship them in interstate commerce are covered by the wage and hour law and will not be exempted therefrom by this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think, in view of the statement the Senator from Delaware has made, that he is willing, when the bill comes back from conference, to consider the matter upon its merits, and so the danger of the rider diminishes.

I have made the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected. I am going to vote for the amendment. I will try to get the bill out of conference, because it is vital that something be done for the people primarily affected by it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD preceding the passage of House bill 9023 a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

I wish to associate myself with the senior Senator from Delaware in urging the adoption of this amendment which will eliminate a gross inequity against numerous self-employed workers, including the holly-wreath makers of our eastern shore. These workers, whose products add so immeasurably to our enjoyment of Christmas seasons, gather their holly boughs whenever and wherever they can, without reference to any type of time-clock schedule. They fashion these boughs into yuletide ornaments on a schedule, if I can use that word, which is equally as uncertain, taking advantage of whatever free moments come their way. To impose on these people the necessity of keeping strict records on their hours is obviously unwise and unworkable, and regulations which do so should be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1957, p. 13745, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the conference report was unanimously agreed to by all the House conferees and all the Senate conferees. There was no question with regard to it.

I send to the desk a statement which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, in explanation of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CARILONA

The conference substitute, which was agreed upon unanimously by the conferees, differs from the bill passed by the Senate in the following respects:

(1) The conference substitute will make the feed-wheat exemption effective with the 1958 crop, while the Senate bill would have made it retroactive to the 1954 crop. To give the bill retroactive effect would involve the difficult, if not impossible, task of determining the disposition of wheat raised in violation of acreage allotments in past years and the making of refunds. Those who raised excess wheat solely for feed in past years violated their acreage allotments as fully as did those who raised excess wheat and sold or otherwise disposed of a part of their crop, so that in many cases the distinction which the Senate bill would have required would be a very fine one.

(2) The conference substitute will restrict the feed-wheat exemption to farms on which the wheat acreage does not exceed 30 acres, except in the case of State, county, religious, or eleemosynary institutions.

(3) The conference substitute provides that the estimated production from the excess acreage planted pursuant to the feed-wheat exemption shall not be counted in determining total supply or normal supply for the purpose of marketing quota or price-support determinations.

(4) The conference substitute includes a provision which is the same in substance as one contained in S. 606 passed by the Senate on June 24, 1957, and which provides that excess wheat acreage shall not be counted in determining future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The House amendment in this respect would have gone further than S. 606 or the conference substitute and provided that the production from such acreage would not be counted in determining future marketing quotas and price-support levels. This would have required a larger supply before quotas would be proclaimed, tended to increase the amount of the quota, and tended to increase the minimum price-support level required by law. The Department of Agriculture recommended that this provision be limited to the excess acreage raised under the feed-wheat exemption, and the conference substitute so provides.

The foregoing are the major differences between the Senate bill and the conference substitute. Certain minor changes were also made. The feed-wheat exemption provision of the conference substitute premits removal of wheat from the farm for processing for feed use; makes it clear that no exempt wheat may be exchanged for goods or services; and provides that an exempt producer may not vote in the referendum for the next crop rather than that a producer voting in the referendum for any crop may not obtain an exemption for that crop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ELIMINATION OF TIME LIMITATION ON CERTAIN GRANTS UNDER SECTION 4 (A) OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

The bill (S. 2254) to eliminate the time limitation on certain grants under section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of Senators to the fact that House bill 8429 is comparable to Senate bill 2254, Calendar No. 1018. Does the distinguished Senator from Washington desire consideration of the House bill at this time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 8429.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the difference between the two bills. There is a difference in time, is there not, between the House bill and the Senate bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. PURTELL. If that is the understanding, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8429) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 8429?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2254 is indefinitely postponed.

TIME LIMIT FOR SALE OF CERTAIN WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate conferees are holding a final conference with the House conferees on the supplemental appropriation bill. I must attend.

I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1015, House Joint Resolution 370. The Senator from Michigan and I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and he has withdrawn his objection. We would like to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) to extend the time limit for the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels for utilization on essential trade routes 3 and 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 886, House bill 8755. An agreement has been reached with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and I believe the bill can now be passed by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator who objected to House bill 8755 withdrawn his objection?

Mr. JAVITS. I understand he has agreed to do so. The Senator from Michigan will make a statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8755) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social-security coverage under its agreement separately for those of its employees who are covered by a retirement system and who desire such coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, my understanding was that Calendar No. 886, House bill 8755 was not objected to. It went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. The understanding of the Senator is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it had been my intention to offer an amendment to the bill. Michigan is one of the States where policemen and firemen may, by their own option, come under the Social Security Act. However, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] has indicated that if such an amendment as was contemplated were offered he would oppose the bill.

Rather than see firemen and policemen from other States to be covered by the proposed legislation prejudiced, I will not offer my amendment at this time.

I wish the RECORD to show that many communities, particularly smaller communities in the State of Michigan, feel a need for social security protection. I regret that we have not had a unified position of police and firemen within our State, so that the amendment referred to could be included in the bill.

Therefore I shall not offer my amendment. If I do not do so, I understand that the junior Senator from Michigan will not object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Michigan. Speaking on behalf of the State of New York, we want legislation of this character very much, as do other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All amendments to House bill 8755 have been agreed to. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 395) to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 6. This act shall continue in effect until a date 10 years after the date of the enactment of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct research in, or conduct training of teachers in, fields related to education of mentally retarded children. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such personnel and for establishing and maintaining fellowships, with such stipends as may be determined by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining, directly or through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, fellowships or traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of mentally retarded children or as supervisors of such teachers.

SEC. 3. Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner of Education from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "nonprofit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(b) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in the State.

SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

SEC. 6. This act shall continue in effect until a date ten years after the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIG. GEN. CHESTER W. GOBLE

The bill (S. 655) for the relief of Brig. Gen. Chester W. Goble, was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Brig. Gen. Chester W. Goble, Army of the United States, retired, shall be advanced on the Army of the United States retired list to the rank of major general effective March 1, 1955, and shall be entitled to retired pay from such date computed on the basis of the rate of basic pay to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in the grade of major general.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CALIFORNIA IN EXCHANGE FOR OTHER LAND

The bill (H. R. 787) to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the United States of America and the State of California was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON H. R. 787

This bill would authorize an exchange of 13-plus acres of Federal land in the Alameda Administration Center, California, for 20-plus acres of land to be conveyed by the State to the United States.

The exchange transaction is required in order to make possible the State's construction of a new tube between Oakland and Alameda under the Alameda estuary.

According to Senate Report No. 998, the 20-plus acres to be conveyed by the State are valued at $181,872 (Rept. No. 998, p. 2).

The land to be transferred to the State has an unimproved value of $173,870. (Ibid., p. 4.)

The only problem presented is in connection with the fact that roads, hardstand, rail facilities, fencing, and utilities were constructed at a prorated cost of $404,217 on the Federal acreage. However, Report No. 998 observes that the State has agreed "to relocate Government-owned facilities, utilities, and improvements from the lands made available for tube and roadway purposes and reestablish them in accordance with Army requirements."

It would appear that the United States will receive full consideration for the exchange, particularly in view of the fact that the State will bear the cost of relocating facilities and the tube will improve the traffic situation at the Alameda Administration Center.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire about the Calendar No. 1020, House bill 8076?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from Colorado, that that bill was passed before the beginning of the call of the calendar.

CONVEYANCE OF ESLER FIELD, LA., TO THE PARISH OF RAPIDES, LA.

The bill (H. R. 2816) to provide for the conveyance of Esler Field, La., to the parish of Rapides in the State of Louisiana and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection? I understand that the Senator from Georgia is cooperating again, by offering an objection on my behalf.

Mr. TALMADGE. I withhold the objection. I objected in behalf of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who I think will make a statement with regard to the bill which is not contained in the committee's report, and which clarifies the committee report, if I correctly understand the situation.

I want the Senator from Mississippi to know that my objection to the bill in its present form is that I do not think it makes clear what the Federal interest is in the transfer. I understand that the history of this particular project is such that the Federal Government has a substantial interest in this transfer, and that when it is explained for the RECORD it will be seen that it does not, in fact, violate the Morse formula.

I should like to have the Senator from Mississippi tell the Senate what he told the Senator from Oregon in personal conversation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will handle the bill. The Senator from Mississippi expected to be absent. I think the Senator from Washington is familiar with it, and can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator from Washington, so far as I am concerned, to address himself only to the question of what the Federal interest in this transfer is. What benefits will the Federal Government get from the transfer? The Senator will recall that originally the transfer was made for National Guard purposes.

If the Senate will bear with me for a moment, I shall state my understanding of the bill.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the parish title to Esler Field, in Louisiana.

On the basis of the record, it seems that there is no consideration involved for the conveyance. My understanding is that there is a military benefit to the Federal Government which would come from the transfer—for National Guard purposes, and so forth. For the purpose of establishing a legislative history of the bill, I should like to have the Senator from Washington demonstrate that the Federal Government would get value from the transfer. Otherwise, I would have to object to the bill. My understanding is that there is adequate Federal interest in the transfer to meet the requirements of the Morse formula.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding, of course, that the usual recapture clause is contained in the grant in connection with the agreement to be entered into between the Federal Government and the parish, and that if the parish shall fail to utilize the airfield as a public airport for a period of 2 successive years, title shall revert to the United States.

In addition, the United States shall have the right of reentry in the event of a national emergency, and there are the usual reservations and restrictions with reference to the mineral rights, and so forth.

I am informed that the Government's interest is that the State of Louisiana may use the field for National Guard purposes. In addition, the city of Alexandria, which is within the parish of Rapides, donated its public airport to the United States Government for use as an Army Air Corps base during World War II. Since World War II the base has been made into a permanent Air Force installation, known as England Air Force Base.

Since World War II the city of Alexandria has been allowed to use the field for commercial aviation. However, this arrangement has been highly unsatisfactory. Not only is the base crowded with jet aircraft, but, with commercial planes landing on the base, the safety hazard has increased. Furthermore, additional commercial lines serving central Louisiana are reluctant to come into this area because of unsatisfactory operating conditions.

In other words, the city of Alexandria conveyed to the Federal Government, without charge, its base which is now being used by the Air Force. The city of Alexandria would like to use Esler Field. In the meantime it has given up its occupancy of what is now England Air Force Base. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Oregon will agree that there is ample consideration flowing to the Federal Government as a result of the arrangement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the explanation of the Senator from Washington. When the bill first reached my desk I felt there was not shown in the report or in the bill an adequate Federal interest which would justify the transfer.

There are many cases of such transfers having been authorized within the Morse formula because of the Federal defense interest, such as National Guard use, and the availability of the base for different purposes, including a reversion clause, which is included in the pending bill. I therefore wish the RECORD to show that I am satisfied that the return the Federal Government will get from the defense use of the property justifies the transfer. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of H. R. 2816, to which the Senator from Oregon has withdrawn his objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE GULFPORT MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT, MISSISSIPPI

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a few moments ago S. 1746 was announced as next in order. At that time the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] indicated an objection. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is now on the floor, and he is prepared to answer any questions the Senator from Oregon may have. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that order 872 be considered at this time.